1-1-1974

The U.S. teacher center movement.

Sherran Simson Toll
University of Massachusetts Amherst

THE U. S. TEACHER CENTER MOVEMENT

A Dissertation Presented

By

SHERRAN SIMSON TOLL

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1974

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

THE U. S. TEACHER CENTER MOVEMENT

A Dissertation Presented by

SHERRAN SIMSON TOLL

APPROVED AS TO STYLE AND CONTENT BY:

Masha Rudman

Dr. Masha Rudman, Chairman

Richard Konicek

Dr. Richard Konicek, Member

John C. Ball

Dr. John Ball, Member
Temple University

Klaus Schultz

Dr. Klaus Schultz, Dean's Representative

May 1974

Dwight W. Allen

Dr. Dwight Allen
Dean of the School of
Education

The U. S. Teacher Center Movement

Sherran S. Toll

B. A. University of Kentucky
M. A. T. Manhattanville College

Directed by Dr. Masha Rudman

ABSTRACT

This study presents a methodology for surveying the establishment and operation of U. S. teacher centers. It defines teachers centers as being semi-autonomous organizations with a physical facility, the purpose of which is to encourage the in-service professional growth of teachers, in which teachers are involved in the decision-making and administrative processes involved in operating the centers. This study contributed to the body of research in in-service education by gathering, presenting, and analyzing information in this area.

Chapter I defines teachers centers and states the need for further research in this field. Also included in Chapter I is a review of the literature and the methodology and format used for the study. Chapter II gives a brief history of in-service education in the U. S. and specifies ways in which traditional methods of in-service education have not been effective in bringing about long lasting

educational changes within the classroom. This chapter relates the growth of the U. S. teacher center movement to heightened interest in British informal education in America. Chapter III presents information obtained by developing a questionaire which was sent to all identified teachers centers. Included in this chapter is also information gained from visiting fifteen centers and from various types of information printed by the centers about their activities. An analysis of the information is presented according to ten basic areas of interest: goals and reasons for being established, length of time in operation, fiscal arrangements, educational programs, affiliation with other educational organizations, staffing arrangements, methods of communicating center activities, decision-making practices, physical facilities, and community involvement. Chapter IV presents profiles of five centers. The centers chosen are representative of the variety of centers which responded to the survey. This chapter focuses upon aspects of the centers' development and functioning which are particularly interesting and/or innovative. In this chapter is an account of the efforts to form a teacher center network on a national scale. Included in Chapter V are a summary of the study and recommendations for future research. The appendices and a bibliography complete the study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To;

Masha	For believing and helping to make all things possible,
Dick	For supporting and assisting,
John	For encouraging and challenging through the years,
Dee and Kay	For giving up their mother so many times and for being proud,
Chuck	For loving.

Dedicated to my parents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose and Delineation of Study 1
Review of the Literature 6
Methodology 13
Limitations. 16

II. IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS. 18

Traditional and Innovative Programs. 18
Open Education and Its Influence on Teachers Centers 32
Teacher Centers and Change Agents. 44

III. THE SURVEY 51

Methodology. 51
Goals. 54
Time in Operation-Use of Centers 63
Fiscal Arrangements. 66
Staffing Complement. 81
Physical Facilities. 87
Educational Programs 96
Communication of Center Activities 109
Affiliation with Other Organizations 111
Decision-Making. 116
Community Involvement. 121

IV. TEACHER CENTER PROFILES. 125

Collection of the Data 125
Overview 125
The Profiles 127
Notes on Additional Centers. 146
Efforts to Coordinate the Teacher Center Movement on a National Scale 160

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 166

Summary. 166
Recommendations for Further Research 168
Conclusion 175

BIBLIOGRAPHY 177

APPENDICES 185

Appendix A. Survey Instrument. 185
Appendix B. List of Centers Which Responded to the Questionaire. 190
Appendix C. Stated Goals of the Centers. 194
Appendix D. Workshops Offered. 199

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	List of Centers According to Their Goals	56
2.	Stated Goals of Teachers Centers by Category	58
3.	Length of Time in Operation	63
4.	Centers Grouped by Years in Operation by 1973	64
5.	Number of Visitors to the Centers in 1972-1973	65
6.	Original Sources of Funding	68
7.	Funding Sources in 1972-1973	71
8.	Relationship Between Years in Operation and Type of Funding Source	73
9.	Workshop Fees Covering the Cost of a Workshop	75
10.	Free Services	78
11.	Staffing Complement	83
12.	Types of Physical Facilities Available in the Centers	90
13.	Size of the Center	94
14.	Workshops Offered	100
15.	Workshops Held in Schools	103
16.	Pre-Registration for Workshops	103
17.	Drop-In Policies	105
18.	Hours the Centers Are Open	106
19.	Availability of an Advisory Service	107
20.	Methods of Cummunicating Centers' Activities	110

LIST OF TABLES CONTINUED

Table

21. Affiliations with Other Organizations . . . 112

22. Credit Available for Workshop Participation 114

23. Decision-Making Practices 118

24. Community Involvement 123

FORWARD

I first became interested in teachers centers in the summer of 1970. That summer I received funds from my school system (Greenwich, Connecticut) to attend a workshop in open education at the Fayerweather Street School in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The teacher with whom I taught and another teacher from my school also attended the month long workshop.

That summer I had the opportunity to visit many of the resource centers open to teachers in the Boston area. I learned how valuable it was to be able to share ideas and problems with other teachers who shared my interests and philosophy about open education.

Once back in the classroom, I was cut off from the support group I had found so helpful. I was fortunate in being able to use observation days to visit other open classrooms to continue to get new ideas about curriculum development and materials. I watched the newspapers for announcements of Saturday workshops or weekend seminars in the New York-Connecticut area. I had to make great effort to continue my own education, for little went on in my school system in the area of open education.

My school was not committed to informal methods of learning and teaching. I felt I had to protect what went on in my classroom, for to state that I had problems would be to open myself to directives to return to more

traditional methods. The principal who had brought me into the school because of my training in Montessori-open education programs had left, and the new principal was less than enthusiastic about informal methods. I needed a support system outside my school and an accessible resource center for new ideas.

During 1971-1972 I was able to take a trip to England and visit the Leicester Teacher Center, as well as to spend a week in the schools in the area. That year I also made a trip to the Denver-Boulder area where I was able to visit two teachers centers as well as two Living and Learning Schools. I did get new ideas and renewed enthusiasm from my visits; but the sources of support were far from Greenwich, Connecticut.

In the summer of 1972, I attended another workshop in open education or The Integrated Day at the University of Massachusetts. The directors of this workshop, like the directors of the Fayerweather Street Workshop, encouraged at least two teachers from each school to attend; they realized the teacher's need for on-going support. Unlike the Fayerweather situation, the Integrated Day staff also requested the administrator of the school where the teachers worked to attend a week long training session. They also wanted to maintain continued contact with these teachers throughout the school year and were able to do so because of their in-service/pre-service program involving liason personnel who work in the schools.

During the fall of 1972, I became aware that there were many more resources in the New York geographic area than I had previously realized. Through my position as Consultant in Open Education Program Development at the New York Botanical Garden, I came into contact with Museum Collaborative, Inc., an organization which was promoting the establishment of resource centers for teachers and the more frequent use of these resources already in existence.

While I worked at the Garden, Mr. John Reed, Director of the Education Department, encouraged this study of teachers centers and enabled me to use the Garden's facilities in printing and mailing the survey instruments.

With this background, I moved to Philadelphia in June, 1973 and visited the Durham Teacher Center looking for a job. During the summer, there was little activity. The director was away. Funding had been cut; some of the center staff had to find work elsewhere. There was no promise of a job there.

In November, 1973, I started working as the Resident Evaluator for the Pre-kindergarten Head Start Program in Philadelphia. As I visited the twenty-two centers in the program and attended staff meetings, I became aware of how little use was being made of the two well-established teacher centers in the area, the Durham Parent Teacher Center and the District Six Advisory Center. Head Start programs needed many more materials for the children to use; the staff felt isolated and needed a support system.

Through my activities at the Research Office as part of the Early Childhood Evaluation Team,I learned that Day Care Services offers an extensive selection of workshops each month for their staff. These services are usually held at one of the two teachers centers and can be attended by Head Start staff on a space availability basis. But the Head Start administrative staff does not want to release staff during the school day to attend the workshops. The centers are not very convenient to those working in many programs; staff does not generally go there on their own time. Only rarely, as I go from classroom to classroom, do I find evidence of materials made at the centers.

These centers are doing important work and other small offshoots are being started at different points throughout the city. The number of teachers who use their facilities is small when compared with the number of teachers in the system, but more teachers and programs are using the centers every year. Teachers centers in Philadelphia are making a difference in classrooms where teachers have attended their workshops--I can see their effects in Follow Through Classrooms throughout the city--gradually the centers are beginning to touch many of the elementary teachers in the system.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Delineation of Study

The purpose of this study, the U. S. Teacher Center Movement, is to present a methodology for surveying the establishment and operation of U. S. teachers centers. This study is concerned with ten basic areas of center operation: goals and reasons for being established, time in operation, fiscal arrangements, staffing patterns, physical facilities, educational programs, communication of center activities, affiliation with other organizations, decision-making procedures and community involvement. Information is presented in these categories about the centers as a group as well as about individual centers. The study is concerned with those centers which have been referred to as teachers centers by at least one of several informed sources. Attention is given to the ramifications for changes in in-service education teachers centers are beginning to make.

This study documents the theory that teachers centers are a growing phenomenon on the American educational scene rather than isolated incidents of teachers getting together. The issues to which this study is addressed are--what do alternative models of centers look like and how do they operate? who makes the policies and the daily decisions necessary to operate the centers? what are some of the ways teachers centers and schools systems and colleges of education

are affecting each other? The answers to these questions should be valuable to people in university settings because it will give those in teacher education information about which aspects of center programs are most desired by teachers. The study provides information to people who work in centers or are in staff development positions in school systems about what people in similar positions are doing. Finally, the information presented in this study is significant because of the importance of the movement in the annals of U. S. educational history.

The study presents a methodology used by a single individual to collect and analyze information about centers throughout the United States. Given more extensive resources, other methodologies might be able to obtain different and more detailed information. It is beyond the scope of this methodology to measure the effectiveness of teachers centers as far as increasing the quality of education for those children whose teachers who have used a center or even to determine the extent to which teachers have changed their classrooms because of their participating in center activities. Certainly research in these areas, as well as that which measures teacher attitudes about centers vis à vis traditional professional growth programs, ought to be undertaken. Within the next few years, the centers will have been in operation long enough to make this possible.

Definition of Teachers Centers

Because the word "center" has acquired several different meanings within the educational context, for the purpose of this study, a teacher center will be defined as a semi-autonomous organization with a physical facility, the purpose of which is to encourage the in-service professional growth of teachers, in which teachers are involved in the decision-making and administrative processes involved in operating the center. Those organizations which are operated for the benefit of teachers but in which the teachers have no power and are consumers only have either been excluded or cited as such.

Overview

The establishment, within the past few years, of teachers centers as viable alternatives and/or complements to university courses for in-service education is significant. It marks the first time that teachers have taken upon themselves the responsibility for their own professional development. Within the public school setting, teachers are making more decisions about the instructional process; through the teacher center, teachers are using freedom and responsibility to harness both their own energies and the energies of their students. Until recently, disregarding off-shoot radical educational ventures, the university, the state board of education, the city board of education, the

superintendent and the curriculum specialists have determined what should or should not go on inside the classroom rather than relying on the professional judgment of the teacher who works with the children on a day to day basis.

How much autonomy teachers should be given has long been a subject of debate. As teachers become more autonomous or as their autonomy becomes recognized as being legitimate, the teacher as a decision-maker about his/her own education, as well as the education of the children within the classroom, becomes increasingly important.

In analyzing the social structure of the school, Charles Bidwell has stated that, "an important facet of school-system organization is the autonomy granted to--or perhaps demanded by--the teacher as a professional to make discretionary judgments about procedures to be used during the time a student group is in his charge."[1]

As administrators have traditionally decided what went on in the classroom, so have they determined what in-service education teachers needed. As teachers are held accountable for what occurs in their classroom, so do they have more freedom in deciding the activities and practices within their room. The teacher center has been designed to be of great use to the teacher as he/she is able to exercise his/her autonomy.

---

1. Charles Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization", in James G. Marsh, ed., Handbook of Organizations, (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965), p.975.

As teachers take on a new role in determining the content of the curriculum as well as the methods of instruction, they have begun to explore opportunities for furthering their own professional growth in settings beyond the university. As some states begin to move toward competency-based certification, it becomes possible for teachers to gain these competencies in non-traditional ways. The Ford Foundation, The New World Foundation, The Edward Hazen Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity under Title I and Title III, and a variety of formal and informal teacher groups have all helped to make possible professional growth experiences outside the university and beyond the usual board of education in-service courses.

Throughout the country, teachers who were formerly handed the curriculum and told how much time to spend on each subject are now being held accountable for what goes on in their classroom with regard to the needs of the children rather than with regard to mechanical time structure. Teachers centers are responding to the new priority being given to originality, creativity, and especially, to meeting the specialized needs of a particular child. Teachers centers have become places where teachers become involved in their own learning. The emphasis in many centers is first on how the teacher's learning takes place and then on what the teacher can do to foster the students' learning in the classroom.

Teaching as related to learning behavior is the focus, rather than teaching as related to method.

Review of the Literature

Researchers have only recently begun to undertake large studies of the phenomena. The literature, therefore, is seriously lacking in comprehensive studies of the teacher center movement. Articles which seem to refer to teachers centers often refer to in-service training but not teachers centers as defined in this study.[2] This study undertakes to provide an overall national view of the movement.

Few efforts have been made to gather and to analyze information about U. S. teachers centers. Articles have been written by Paul Pilcher[3] and Karen Branan[4]; a booklet has been compiled by Clare Howard[5]; and a news release has been issued in Syracuse University's School of Education bulletin Update[6]. There have been limited publications on a national scale about U. S. teachers centers. While the

---

2. Bruce R. Joyce and Marshal Weil, "Concepts of Teacher Centers", (Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, May 1973).
3. Paul S. Pilcher, "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" Phi Delta Kappan, Jan., 1973, pp. 340-343
4. Karen Branan, "Try a Teacher Center", Scholastic Magazine, Sept., 1972.
5. Clare Howard, Scholastic Teacher"s Guide to Teacher Centers, (New York: Scholastic Magazines, Inc., 1972)
6. James S. Collins, "Teacher Centers: The State of the Art" in Update, Syracuse University School of Education, Spring, 1972.

"N.E.A. Prospectus"[7] has invited teachers centers across the country to unite in order to exchange information and services, nothing yet has been published in this respect by the N.E.A. of which the author is aware.

Paul Pilcher's article addresses the issue at the heart of the teacher center movement. He questions the extent to which power has been redistributed from the hands of the administrator to the hands of the classroom teacher. It is this change in the distribution of power which is necessary if teachers centers are to become an effective and institutionalized method of in-service education.

Pilcher cites Stephen Bailey's article on British teachers centers which sets forth the principles which are basic to the effective functioning of the centers:

> "1. Fundamental educational reform will come only through those charged with the basic educational responsibility, to wit, the teachers.
> 2. Teachers are unlikely to change their ways simply because imperious theoretical reformers tell them to shape up.
> 3. Teachers will take reform seriously only when they are responsible for defining their own educational problems, delineating their own needs, and receiving help on their own turf."[8]

Pilcher's article is concerned with power, he feels that in order for teachers to hold their ground, they have

---

7. Ole Sand, NEA Teacher Center Network, A Prospectus, (Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., Dec., 1972).
8. Stephen K. Bailey, "Teacher Centers: A British First", in Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1971, pp. 146-149.

to be in a strong position with university personnel, school administrators, and the local community.[9]

Karen Branan's article, "Try a Teacher Center", conveys the tone and flavor of teachers centers and calls attention to these new educational ventures. She reports the enthusiastic, varied work that centers are doing. Uncritical and unconcerned with power issues, the theme of Branan's article is, "Try it; you'll like it!".[10]

Scholastic Teacher's Guide to Teachers Centers, researched and compiled by Clare Howard during the early fall of 1972, is a listing of all identified teachers centers with a brief description of their functioning and major thrusts. It gives people working in centers ideas about additional programs to institute and other centers to visit. Uncritical, but also not overly enthusiastic, this guide provided one of the major sources of names of teacher centers to which the questionaire used in this study was sent.[11]

A conference held at Syracuse University in the spring of 1972 on teachers centers was reported in Update, the bulletin from the School of Education. Six alternative models of teachers centers in the United States and England were presented. A theme which emerged from the conference was that there is no single model for a teacher center.

---

9. Pilcher, op. cit., p. 341.
10. Branan, op. cit
11. Howard, op. cit.

Centers have evolved from local needs in ways to meet the particular conditions of a specific locale.

The article categorizes teachers centers into three groups: those started by teachers in which teachers assume the initiative and the responsibility for their operation, those started in connection with a school or a school system, and those in which the responsibility is jointly shared among a university, a school system, a community group, professional teachers' associations, the National Association of Independent Schools or any combination thereof.[12]

James Collins, at the symposium and in the Update article, makes special note of the value teachers centers have in the public school setting. He concludes from his experience that there are major benefits to the schools through the existence of teachers centers. Continuous in-service professional growth opportunities, additional resources for the school especially if other community organizations support the centers, fulfillment of the needs of a specific locale, and increased staff performance because of their involvement in planning, administering and evaluating the programs are all areas

---

12. Update editorial, Syracuse University School of Education, Spring, 1972. p. 1.

which benefit by the existence of teachers centers.[13]

Collins values combining and coordinating in-service with pre-service programs to make the process of teacher education more relevant to the actual needs of the schools. Collins says that the best education is based on practical problems rather than on theoretical issues. He advocates helping professionals defining their own needs as active participants in their own education.[14]

Finally, Collins predicts that, "the teacher center movement will come to national prominence in the next few years (as) there is no slackening of interest or effort on the part of the U.S.O.E. to move ahead with funding to begin in Federal Year 1973."[15]

Teacher center activity at the national level is not important, according to Pilcher. He states that "one of the most important features of the British teachers centers is their homegrown, indigenous nature, arising from the needs and interests of specific districts.

---

13. Collins, op. cit., p. 1
14. Collins, op. cit., p. 2
15. Collins, op.cit. p. 4

National coordination and planning has tended to be supplementary and largely after the fact."[16] While this may be true in some instances, other studies of British teachers centers disagree with Pilcher's view.

One study, commissioned by the U.S.O.E. finds that the impetus for British teachers centers arose from the needs of that national government to provide in-service teacher training programs which would implement the new math and science curriculum developed by the Nuffield Foundation, the major vehicle for curriculum development in England.[17]

Another study of British teachers centers ennumerates several ways in which the national government fostered the development of teachers centers throughout the country. The national government supported the development of local centers for curriculum development without attempting to control the activities of such centers.[18]

The situation in the U. S. is not dissimilar although a large amount of the initial funds for centers

---

16. Pilcher, op. cit., pp. 340-342.
17. Phillip Woodruff and Richard Konicek, "Preliminary Report: British Teacher Centers",unpublished document submitted to U.S.O.E.Program Thrust, May, 1972.
18. Robert Thornbury, ed., Teachers Centres, (New York: Agathon Press, 1974). pp. 1-16, 33-66.

came through private foundations as well as government allocations. In the U. S., federal funding for teacher centers through grants under Title I and Title III(educational innovations and aid to "disadvantaged" children) provided the initial money for centers in the mid-sixties. Centers were developed in Maryland, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia among others.[19] The centers came into focus again at the U.S.O.E.Conference of Teacher Leaders, March 31-April 2, 1972. The conference title was "Task Force '72 and the Classroom Teacher Looks at Educational Reform".[20] While the term "training complex" is used in the report covering the conference, the functions of a training complex are identical to those of most teachers centers. Special attention is given to the role of the teacher in his/her own on-going in-service education.

Teachers centers issue reports and announcements about their activities and development. These are readily available by writing to the centers but are not widely circulated and exist in mimeographed or offset form. The information that was obtained from such materials is presented as part of Chapter III.

---

19. Pilcher, op. cit., p. 340.
20. Phillip Woodruff, "Final Report for Teacher Improvement Leadership Training Institute and the U.S.O.E.: Task Force '72 and the Classroom Teacher looks at Educational Reform", unpublished mimeograph submitted to the U.S.O.E., March, 1972.

Methodology

This study presents a methodology for collecting and analyzing information on U. S. teachers centers. Several processes were involved in the study; each one contributed to the other; all are necessary to present a full description of the movement. Listed below are the processes used in the study:

1. A questionaire was formulated, revised and sent to identified teachers centers to obtain information about their establishment and operation.

2. Materials printed by the centers, usually in mimeograph or offset form, were collected. The information they contained was sorted into those categories addressed by the questionaire, enabling a fuller interpretation of the answers written by center personnel.

3. Fifteen centers were visited. Informal discussions were held with centers staffs.

4. Personal contact was made with a variety of people who were familiar with teachers centers and with teachers who used the centers.

5. All sources of information are brought together, analyzed, and presented to give a full description of U. S. teachers centers.

Format

Chapter I of this study gives the rationale and defines the parameters of the work. It includes a review of the literature and states the various processes which compose the methodology. Also included in Chapter I is the format for the study and the limitations.

Chapter II deals with a brief historic background of the types of professional growth opportunities available to teachers in the United States. Special emphasis is placed on the ways in which traditional programs have not been able to effect changes in the educational process and the ways in which teachers centers are designed to overcome these past inabilities of in-service programs. This chapter presents the relationship between the growth in the number of U. S. centers and the growing interest in open education. It also indicates the ways in which British centers have served to foster the growth of centers in the United States.

Chapter III describes the development of the questionaire, the ways in which centers were selected, and what was done with the information thus received. Tables summarizing the findings are analyzed and additional information obtained from center publications is presented. The major findings for each category are summarized. The areas covered in Chapter III are:

1. Goals and Reasons for Being Established
2. Length of Time in Operation
3. Fiscal Arrangements
4. Staffing Patterns
5. Physical Facilities
6. Educational Programs
7. Communication of Center Activities
8. Affiliation with Other Organizations
9. Decision-Making Procedures
10. Community Involvement

Chapter IV contains profiles of five centers. The centers were chosen either because of the author's personal

involvement with the centers or because there was a lot of information available about them. This chapter presents those aspects many centers have in common as well as those in which they differ. Notes on additional centers are included.

Chapter V presents efforts to coordinate centers' activities on a national level. Those mentioned include efforts by the N.E.A., Syracuse University, and Madison Judson.

Chapter VI summarizes the methodology employed in this study and makes recommendations for future research. Questions are raised about continuing funding patterns, the impact and measure of change in the schools, shifts in the power in educational decision-making, and the extent to which centers are being integrated into the existing educational institutions on the city, regional, and state levels and into national educational organizations.

The appendices include a list of centers which responded to the survey, the survey instrument, a list of the responses given by each center as its goal, a list of workshop titles compiled from center publications, the N.E.A.Prospectus, and an evaluation instrument formulated by the University of Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network to measure the effect the centers are having on the schools. Finally a bibliography completes the study.

Limitations

This study presents a methodology used by one person without substantial resources to obtain information about in-service organizations across the United States. These and other limitations are acknowledged and should be kept in mind when interpreting the findings.

1. Limitations Created Because of Sample

While the percentage of return (71% of those centers surveyed) of the questionaires is quite high, it is uncertain whether or not the trends which appear in the data collected would also apply to those centers which did not respond. It is unknown whether or not those centers which answered neither the initial nor the second request for information had characteristics in common with the group which did respond.

2. Limitations Created Because of the Source List for Centers

While the study did not seek information about in-service programs which did not have a physical facility or in which teachers were not involved in the decision-making processes, there may be centers which function according to the definition, which were unknown to any of the sources from which the center list was compiled. There may be more centers in the eastern U. S. in fact or these may appear to be more numerous because of the familiarity of the person who compiled the list with that part of the country.

3. LimitationsCreated Because a Single Individual Completed the Questionaire

All of the answers given to items on the questionaire were the opinions of the individual who filled out the form, usually the center director. Generally the director should have a good idea about the information requested by the form. However, answers, in some cases, were opinions and, in others, called for numerical information, which might not be too reliable. Answers to the questions might have varied if they had been obtained by an outside investigator or by a teacher who used the facility or the services available.

4. Limitations Because of the Instrument

Because the instrument was developed for this study and did not go through a period of refinement, some questions did not solicit clear answers. In some cases, no answers were given. It is not known whether the person who completed the questionaire did not know the answer, did not understand the question, felt the answer would take too long to complete, or felt the question was inappropriate. In one case, the question about community involvement, the responses are so varied and ambiguous, that it is difficult to interpret the information thus obtained. The conclusions drawn from the responses should be made with the knowledge that the instrument is not yet refined.

CHAPTER II

IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Traditional and Innovative Programs

The history of in-service teacher education in the United States has been long and relatively stable in its basic premises until quite recently. The types of programs available traditionally have not addressed themselves to those factors which inhibit change according to a variety of theories about educational change. The overview of the history of in-service education will focus particularly on those aspects of the programs which have not been effective in bringing about educational changes.

The purpose of all in-service education is to cause changes in the classroom which will result in better learning for the students involved. Teachers centers are innovations designed to effect change resulting in improved learning opportunities for youngsters; in doing so, they present strategies for dealing with those forces resistant to change which differ from those which have accompanied in-service courses.

Herbert Thomas Tilley has made a study of the history of in-service programs in the U.S. He states that in the early years of in-service education, during the middle of the nineteenth century, programs were geared toward remedying "extensive teacher incompetence".[1]

---

1. Herbert Thomas Tilley, "In-Service Teacher Education: A Tool for Change", University of Massachusetts, Amherst, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1971, p.71.

Institutes were started, and in 1848, teachers were instructed in the same manner that "good teachers ought to drill their students". Memorization and repetition were stressed.[2]

The idea that in-service programs should focus on teachers' weaknesses rather than their strengths has continued to be prevalent to the present time. In-service courses have often been established because the administrators felt the teachers were not performing sufficiently well. Teachers have often felt that administrators believed they were deficient and resisted having to attend in-service sessions scheduled for "their own good".

Weynant states that, "A major reason for teachers' criticism of - or lack of response to - traditional in-service programs appears to be the emphasis placed on teachers' deficiencies.[3] While certainly the rigid formality common to teacher training in the 1800's has disappeared, courses, nevertheless, continue to focus on teachers' weaknesses rather than their strengths.

Slowly, involvement of the teachers came to be on a more personal basis with the development of reading circles. Books were assigned by the professor or leader and their literary merits were discussed. Teachers were urged to read and there was discussion among the participants.[4]

---

2. Tilley, op. cit., p. 72
3. Louise Weynant, "Teachers" Strengths: Basis for Successful In-Service Experiences" in Educational Leadership, April, 1971, p. 710.
4. Tilley, op. cit., p. 74-75.

By the 1920's, in-service courses had expanded to include correspondence courses, after-school programs, summer school courses and extension courses. The use of college-based courses increased around this time. Professors were thinking of alternative modes of development. Still, the professors decided what was best for the teachers. The courses were not practically oriented: their requirements were clear-cut and straight forward with little allowance for individual needs and differences in application.[5]

These characteristics of traditional in-service programs have resulted in them receiving little teacher support. Teachers have gone because they were required to do so or else because they had to attend courses in order to advance further on the salary scale.

In defining some of the problems of traditional types of in-service education, Weynant states that teachers criticize the programs for 1) being irrelevant to the real issues in the classroom, 2) being in conflict with methods and strategies currently employed, and 3) being formulated without regard to teachers' interests, wishes, and teaching strengths.[6]

The 1930's saw the emergence of new curriculum areas formerly not included in teacher preparation programs. Art, music and physical education gained in importance. Teachers had to take additional courses in

---

5. Tilley, op. cit., pp. 74-78.
6. Weynant, op. cit., p. 710.

order to be advised of the new curriculum. Specialists were hired by school systems in order to facilitate the needed in-service work. This marked a shift away from university courses. Yet, the initiative was still taken by administrators rather than by the teachers themselves.[7]

The question of who initiates and controls the change process has been raised by social scientists studying organizational change, especially change within the social structure of the school. Those theorists who regard change as basically a problem solving process hold that it is crucial for teachers to initiate and control educational changes if those changes are to have long-lasting effects. This theory, which would not advocate the initiation and control of in-service education by administrators, is based on the primary assumption that

" innovation is a part of a problem-solving process which goes on inside the user. Problem-solving is usually seen as a patterned sequence of activities beginning with a need, sensed and articulated by the client (i.e., the teacher). When he has thus formulated a problem statement, the client-user is able to conduct a meaningful search and retrieval of ideas and information which can be used in formulating or selecting the innovation. Finally, the user needs to concern himself with adapting the innovation, trying out and evaluating its effectiveness in satisfying his original need. The role of outsiders is therefore consultative or collaborative."[8]

---

7. Tilley, op. cit., p. 75
8. Ronald and Mary C. Havelock, Training for Change Agents, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1973), p. 10.

This view of change through in-service education has teachers rather than administrators or university professors in the central role.

In the twenty years from 1940-1960, teacher education became increasingly concerned with motivation techniques. By the mid-fifties, the workshop had become the most widely used alternative to university courses.[9] The workshop gained popularity with teachers, as they could become active participants rather than passive observers. The attention that had been given to motivation led those involved in teacher education to formulate programs in which motivation and activity went together.

The concern for active participation by teachers in in-service courses led to them becoming more involved in planning and implementing the courses as well. This type of involvement, and consequent control, runs counter to the traditional view of the teacher as a bureaucratic functionary with little power to initiate change. Teachers who were encouraged to become active in the process of their own education began to be confronted, outside the in-service situation, with the view that,"once decisions have been made (by administrators),all teachers are expected to follow the basic patterns that have been established".[10]

---

9. Tilley, op. cit., pp. 74-78.
10. Alice Jwaideb and Gerald W. Markus, Bringing About Change in Social Studies Education, (Bouler,Colorado: Social Studies Consortium, Inc. 1973), p. 12.

There continued to develop two schools of thought: one which viewed teachers as active decision-makers and one which viewed teachers as implementing the decisions others had made.

In describing different methods for in-service education currently available, John Moffitt cites several benefits to be gained through the workshop approach. He states that workshops are useful for increasing rapport among school personnel, for meeting a wide variety of needs in differing situations, for increasing morale and establishing a support system among the participants, for fostering the sharing of information and ideas among the participants, and for fulfilling the needs of people with diverse backgrounds and interests within a single situation.[11]

The lack of cooperative sharing among teachers has been an important obstacle preventing change. Jwaideb and Markus state that,

> "status insecurity causes teachers to avoid cooperation and informal communication with colleagues regarding questions of teaching and learning. Teachers tend to be especially reluctant to discuss classroom difficulties with other teachers. Thus, on those very problems that are most critical, teachers are least likely to seek advice from their colleagues."[12]

The workshop is able to break down some of the barriers that isolate teachers from each other so that they begin to open

---

11. John Clifton Moffitt, In-Service Education for Teachers, (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963), p. 26.
12. Jwaideb and Markus, op. cit., p. 13.

up and share their concerns with others in a non-threatening atmosphere.

In addressing the need for teachers to interact with one another and to establish a support system in order to facilitate changes within the classroom, Havelock has stated that,

> "We need to develop temporary social systems to help participants deal with back-home problems by exposure to a variety of resources - including each other - and to each other in such a way that the people involved come to rely on one another as major resource persons."

It has been difficult for traditional forms of in-service programs to foster the development of such a support system. Traditionally, the programs have met for a brief period of time, in a formal way, and have disbanded. Once the program is over, the teachers are cut off from each other and have no place to which they can return nor any person on whom they can rely when a need arises.

Management techniques, real problems and real situations began to appear more frequently in in-service programs after 1960. Since then, the number of alternative ways teachers can continue their own education has increased considerably.

Yet one report on in-service courses questions their effectiveness in terms of better education for children. An NEA study shows that although 96% of the school districts

---

13. Havelock, op. cit., p. 31

in a given area offered opportunities for special in-service programs, only 3.4% of the districts considered their participation in the program as having a positive effect upon continued professional growth. Other reports on in-service programs have termed them "uninspired, ineffective and in low repute."[15]

Tilley's report states that,

" only in a relatively few and scattered cases have teachers utilized their creativeness and individualized the curriculum content to meet student needs..[16] Many times in-service programs have not been relevant to individual teacher needs.. in-service programs often bear little relationship to actual classroom realities."[17]

Tilley concluded, viewing in-service education historically, by saying, "in summary, in-service teacher education has been a low priority vehicle that was largely ineffective for improving classroom instruction between the early 1800's and 1960."[18]

The traditional view of teacher education in which "teachers are not listed as having equal responsibility for structuring the nature of their own in-service offerings" is found in recent books about successful in-service programs.[19]

---

15. Tilley, op. cit., p. 2; Weynant, op. cit., p.710.
16. Tilley, op. cit., p. 37.
17. Tilley, op. cit., p. 3.
18. Tilley, op. cit., p. 94.
19. Ann Byrd Schumer, "An Educational Change Model: Pre-Service, In-Service Continuum", unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, School of Education, August, 1973, p. 39.

Arnold Finch states that the purposes of in-service education are 1) to acquaint him (the teacher) with new techniques, devices and arrangements, 2) to provide him with the results of research on learning and the learning process, and 3) to prepare (him) for new fields and new responsibilities.[20]

In analyzing the traditional view of in-service education, Schumer says that, "all three of these purposes imply a passive receptivity on the part of the teacher. Writings on in-service (education) also convey a lack of direct teacher involvement."[21]

Yet as recently as 1972, there has appeared a book which differs little from the traditional view of in-service education. Kozoll's and Ulmer's book is based on the premise that the administrator does and should decide what in-service education is best for teachers. It is the administrator rather than the teacher who makes the important decisions.[22]

In this guide to better in-service practices, Kozoll and Ulmer stress in-service education as a three step teacher-training process with the administrator in charge. It is the administrator who does the orientation, initial

---

20. Arnold Finch, Growth In-Service Education Programs That Work, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969). pp. 22-23.
21. Schumer, op. cit., p. 39.
22. Charles E. Kozoll and Curtis Ulmer, ed., In-Service Training: Philosophy, Processes, and Operational Techniques, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1972), p.30.

training, and on-going training which constitute a good program. The administrator may work with a committee, "but you should (i.e., you, the administrator) have the option of deciding when and if all of these individuals need to be solicited for information on any one decision, and importantly, what additional people can make a contribution at specified times."[23] It is not up to the teachers when they should be included in the decision-making process; the administrator determines the real problems.

In oder to conduct good in-service training sessions, Kozoll and Ulmer advocate,

" Don't crowd too much into one session. Don't force a subject into an abbreviated time period. Don't expect too high a level of absorption. Don't cut off any staff present from a full and open discussion of any problem or topic. Don't forget to combine recognition with instruction. Don't forget to facilitate exchanges of ideas and variations on the approaches suggested by all members of the staff."[24]

Thus, according to Kozoll and Ulmer, in-service programs should be, for the most part, controlled by someone other than the teacher although the training is for the teacher's own good.

A negative view of teachers' capacities and capabilities is also reflected in an article by Thomas Miller. He states that,

---

23. Kozoll and Ulmer, op. cit., pp. 27-34
24. Kozoll and Ulmer, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

"Some of the more inefficiently planned and directed phases of local school programs are the in-service professional preparation programs for the school staff...Often such planning is beyond the capability of personnel in the local school system."[25]

While Miller suggests that systems cooperate in order to provide adequate in-service programs,he no where implies that the impetus for in-service programs might come from the teachers rather than from the administrators. In his view, administrators plan, direct and coordinate all efforts.

Fear of teachers controlling in-service programs is widespread. Donald McCarty, in an article reviewing some objections to competency-based teacher education programs on both the graduate and undergraduate levels, states,

"...moving control over content and approach (of teacher training programs) off the college campus will tend to reduce the preparation of teachers to a craft. Liberal arts professors will be excluded from an effective voice in the training of future teachers: instead, some hazy but ill-defined Teacher Education Council, dominated by practioners, will set the policies."[26]

Contrary to these views, as early as 1963, John Moffitt said that, "only under those circumstances in which teachers find their own problems and want to do

---

25. Thomas E. Miller, "School Co-ops and Shared Media Services", in School Management and the Business of Education, Vo. 17, No.8, October,1973, p.20.
26. Donald MacCarty, "Competency-Based Teacher Education" in School Management and the Business of Education, Vol. 17, No. 8, October, 1973, pp.32 and 38.

something about them can effective in-service education exist."[27]

In looking at in-service programs, Schumer concludes that those programs which seem to be most effective in bringing about positive changes in the classroom are those,

"In-service, staff development programs (which) are participatory in planning and implementation, held in the teachers' environment, long term in sequence, supportive in nature, volunteer in attendance and when the concepts under consideration are relevant and appropriate to the classroom."[28]

Teachers centers are an appropriate method of in-service education if the teacher is viewed as a responsible decision-maker with regard to his/her own education and with regard to the learning which occurs in the classroom.

In summarizing the way in which one center works in encouraging further professional growth in teachers through their participation in center activities and through the involvement of the center's advisory team as it works with teachers in their classrooms, Jacoby and Zellner state,

"Each class is encouraged to develop its own personality by being responsive to the needs and interests of the children and the talents and style of the teacher...(The center approach) does not tell people what to do; it tries to help them do what they want and to extend what they are capable of doing."[29]

---

27. Moffit, op. cit., pp. 37-38.
28. Schumer, op. cit., p. 42.
29. Eleanor Maccoby and Miriam Zellner, Experiments in Primary Education, Aspects of Project Follow Through, (New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc.,1970),pp.6-7.

A basic framework to effect positive change through in-service programs has eight points:

1. Pre-service teacher training is only the beginning of a continuing program of professional growth.
2. Educational change means changes in teachers' behaviors.
3. Professional growth programs should be year round activities not summer institutes of campus courses alone.
4. Attention should always be given to personal development as well as professional development in such programs.
5. Parents, para-professionals, students, administrators, and teachers should all be involved in in-service programs; the team approach is favored.
6. Fuller use should be made of personnel resources within a school system, i.g., especially the teachers.
7. The programs should focus on the learning process as well as on content skills.
8. The programs should be during school time as much as possible.[30]

Tilley agrees with the Durvall position and continues by adding additional aspects of in-service programs which are prerequisites to effective changes within the classrooms. He suggests 1) flexible scheduling of in-service events, 2) extending the school year so that intensive programs may be staggered throughout the school year, 3) using the environment around the school as an additional resource for learning, and 4) being committed to the basic premise that teachers can, do , and will assume the responsibility

---

30. Durvall, "Dual Opportunity Educational Services, Trends, in In-Service Education", Jackson, Michigan, Jackson Community Schools, 1969, cited in Tilley, op. cit.,p.92.

for their own education provided they are working within an atmosphere where they can function with dignity and respect.[31]

Conclusions About the Role of the Teacher in In-Service Programs

There are two basic viewpoints about in-service education. One is stated very clearly by the N.E.A.,

" The term in-service education is used by educators to denote the efforts of administrative and supervisory officials to promote, by appropriate means, the professional growth and development of educational personnel. Such programs may be promoted by local school systems, by county, city, state or national governments, by professional associations and agencies and by institutions of higher learning."[32]

The role of the teacher in this whole process is only that of a consumer.

The other viewpoint holds that the most effective in-service education is that which is initiated, developed, and implemented by the teachers. This position has been a recent development in the history of in-service education. It is only within the last decade that teachers are able to take advantage of non-university based programs on a wider scale. These programs place a high emphasis on the teacher's initiative. Before the passage of bills which provided federal funding for a number of teachers centers to be established on an experimental basis, teachers had

---

31. Tilley, op. cit., p. 78.
32. ____,"In-Service Education of Teachers, Research Summary, 1966", (Washington, D.C.: N.E.A. Research Division, 1966), p. 3.

to rely on either the university or the administration of their own school system for opportunities to continue their own professional education.

While some teachers did use non-university programs which were of special interest to them--Montessori Teacher Training programs, Audubon Teacher Training Programs in Ecology, a variety of adult education courses, and workshops in a variety of art forms given by art centers--it is only with the establishment and use of teachers centers that teachers have been able to pursue non-traditional alternatives on a wider scale. Graduate and in-service credit for attending such courses has been slower in coming, but increasingly, these alternative forms of education are becoming recognized as legitimate and valuable.

Open Education and Its Influence on the Establishment of Teachers Centers

While there were several teachers centers established as teacher training complexes during the mid-nineteen sixties, the great interest in British infant schools with their informal methods of teaching has brought with it heightened interest in teachers centers. The attraction of British primary education and the support given to informal methods through over six hundred local teachers centers has meant that elementary teachers in the United States as well as in England have been the ones who have used the teachers centers. While the older teachers centers in the U.S. were

not started for elementary teachers vis à vis secondary teachers, those centers which have started to give support to more informal methods of teaching have been designed to be used primarily by teachers of children under eleven years old.

The Hartford, Connecticut school system is one which decided to adopt more informal practices on a city-wide basis, first using Montessori as the guide, and then branching out to include open education methods as well. The program has been supported through the activities of the Teacher Interactive Learning Center.

A statement in the "Teacher Interactive Learning Center Extract" acknowledges the influence of the British example:

> "The teachers center concept has been termed the most significant potential British contribution to American education. The underlying premise of the Teacher Inter-active Learning Center is that, in the final analysis, teachers, and only teachers, can initiate true change. It is the teacher who is charged with the execution of the educational program, and, regardless of the merit or theory underlying the program, it is the teacher's execution that ultimately determines a program's success or its failure.
>
> We concur that the research conducted on and by British teachers centers is convincing enough to warrant a commitment on the part of the City of Hartford to bring to the educational community an exemplary program model which could well prove to be a moving force for educational change in the nation."[33]

---

33. Helen DiCorleto,ed.,"Teacher Interactive Learning Center, An Exemplary Model for Teacher Interactive Learning - Extract", Hartford, Connecticut, Board of Education, 1972, p.8.

The statement is an extremely strong endorsement of the potential of a teachers center to effect change and openly connects the existence of the teachers center in Hartford with the British center movement.

Lilian Weber was one of the first Americans to conduct an in-depth study of informal infant education in England although her interests, at the time, were related more to pre-school than to elementary education. She states,

> "In the general revisions of all primary education toward 'informality', much of the needed education and re-education of teachers has been and continues to be conducted outside of the colleges...Some LEAs (Local Education Authorities) owned old mansions set pleasantly in the country where they kept weekend or longer courses in constant session. All of this had official sanction. In addition, the Nuffield Foundation ran week-long or weekend courses at Teachers Centers or residence halls of colleges all over the country, demonstrating and giving teachers experience in their approach to science and math by involving teachers in working with materials as would children. The Teachers Centers served to bring together materials, publications, and reports of current research. There were often laboratories, giving teachers a chance to become directly acquainted with learning materials, immersing them, workshop fashion, in direct trials of new methods."[34]

As American teachers visit British informal schools they also visit teachers centers and view them as a necessary adjunct in moving American schools toward more informal education.

Vincent Rogers, also a visitor to England who studied British infant schools as early as 1966, points out that British teachers centers have made it possible for teachers to take more responsibility in planning and

---

34. Lilian Weber, The English Infant School and Informal Education, (Englewood, Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 153.

conducting their own in-service education. In reporting on teachers centers, Rogers states that, in most cases, the British educational authorities provide a building in a particular area for the purpose of getting teachers together socially and professionally. The teachers have taken on the responsibility of deciding what courses the center will offer.

"The center is organized and run by teachers, some of whom form an elected committee with a chairman. Action comes through this elected body and all teachers are at liberty to suggest what organization and activity should be...Centers provide a real opportunity for teachers to help themselves..not that they have never done this before.. (But) the center puts them right on the spot and can make available the skill of local teachers for the benefit of colleagues, as well as using outside help to answer the problems and needs of an area."[35]

The British government has provided financial support for the centers while giving teachers on the local level control over what actually happens in the centers. The British government has given further impetus to teachers centers' growth through national publications: Working Paper No. 10, Teachers' Groups and Centers (Schools Council, 1967) Teachers Centers and the Changing Curriculum, A Report on Three National Conferences[36] (Schools Council Pamphlet 6, 1970), The Plowden Report and The James Report.[37]

---

35. Vincent Rogers, Teaching in the British Primary School, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970), pp.279-280.
36. The Plowden Report is the British government's national survey on primary education which strongly endorsed informal education and recognized that it was already a fact in one third of the schools in the country.
37. The James Report strongly endorsed giving a higher priority to in-service education programs.

From 1967-1968, the twelve month period immediately following the publication of The Plowden Report,[38] the number of teachers centers rose from 270 to 470. By 1973, the number had risen to over 600.[39] This rise in the number of teachers centers accompanied the increased recognition of the value of informal methods in England. There has been a parallel in the United States in the growth in popularity of informal practices and the establishment of teachers centers.

Autonomy

Nevertheless, the question of who has the power in the classroom and in the centers is a question which has yet to be resolved in the U.S. "...A fundemantal premise of the Schools Council (the British equivalent to our national department of education) is that the teachers center be a local agency for curriculum development in its own right, not merely the local end of a national pipeline. The centers were first established to give curriculum project personnel feedback as to how their innovations were working with children in schools

---

38. Phillip Woodruff and Richard Konicek, Preliminary Report: British Teacher Centers, Submitted to Mr. Allen Schmieder, U.S.O.E. Program Thrust '73 May 20, 1972, pp. 2-3.
39. Robert Thornbury, ed., Teachers' Centers,(N.Y.Agathon Press, 1974), p. 3. This is a comprehensive collection of articles about the development and functioning of British teachers centers.

and what revisions were necessary to make the project more effective.[40]

Teacher center development has been consistent with the aims of the major influences in educational policy in Britain: The Schools Council, the Department of Education and Science in London, teachers' unions and associations, and curriculum development projects. All of these bodies believe that the teacher is the most responsible person in the educational process. The teacher and the head of the school in consultation should make the basic educational decisions. There is not nearly a consensus on this point in the United States.[41]

Fundamental to the support of teachers centers in England

"is a consistent premise of almost all British educators that there can be no such thing as a national curriculum project introduced into the classroom without a local modification...There appears to be a firmly held belief that 1) teachers grow and develop themselves when provided with opportunities to work together on curriculum in a supportive setting, and 2) the best curriculum materials are those which a teacher has produced for his or her own use. Curriculum development on the local level is seen as an on-going, supported, housed, and sustained curriculum innovation and teacher training endeavor, in which the teacher's role is of primary important."[42]

Teachers centers in Britain generally follow these guidelines: the centers belong to the teachers; the teachers have an active voice in what goes on in the

---

40. Woodruff and Konicek, op. cit., p.3.
41. Weber, op. cit., pp. 233-235.
42. Woodruff and Konicek, op. cit., pp. 3-7.

centers; the administration and head teachers are generally committed to the idea of personal, self-initiated growth for all staff members. Those involved believe that as much learning can take place during the informal social encounters of teachers coming together as in formal course work.[43] This conception of in-service education is not widespread among those who determine educational policy in the United States.[44]

The issue of teacher autonomy has been central to the growth of the center movement in Britain. While there is seldom a single cause for any given result, differences with regard to the legitimacy of a teacher's autonomy and decision-making power probably have as great an influence on the growth of the center movement and the use of centers by individual teachers as any single cause. A look at the British infant schools, particularly the informal ones, makes it possible to gain a better understanding of how teacher centers function in England as well as in the U.S.

Although there is a great deal of variety in the methods and practices in elementary schools throughout the U. S., the British teacher in the individual elementary school may have more autonomy than does the American teacher. Perhaps because many British heads or principals

---

43. Weber, op. cit., pp. 233-234.
44. Weber, op. cit., p. 235.

are able to exercise freedom in determining what goes on inside their schools, they are able to be more experimental and can permit teachers to rely more on their own judgments than do pricipals in many schools in the United States.

In the U. S., the curriculum, especially in those school districts composed of many schools for each age level of children, is sometimes decided centrally for the district as a whole. Every school in the district may be required to adopt the same curriculum and use the same textbooks.

British heads and teachers are able to exercise more autonomy in determining the curriculum. Marilyn Hapgood, in an article first printed in Saturday Review, states that, "The Nuffield Foundation (the vehicle for curriculum reform in England) has given teachers a central role in curriculum reform."[45] This autonomy, with the responsibilies it carries, has been advocated by the government and is the official position.

While British teachers are introducing informal methods of learning in their classrooms, British heads are able to keep a close eye on what is happening in their schools on a day to day basis. They regularly visit the classrooms, often teaching children themselves. They have good ideas about the competencies of the teachers in the schools; the successful heads know when to push and

---

45. Marilyn Hapgood, "The Open Classroom - Protect it From Its Friends " in National Elementary Principal, Vol. VII, No. 3, November, 1972 p. 46.

caution their teachers on an individual basis. Much of this is made possible because British schools are, on the whole, quite a bit smaller than American elementary schools. Heads are not faced with knowing fifty or more members of their staff; their administrative duties are not as time-consuming. Thus British teachers are often given a great deal of latitude in curriculum matters and are able to put into practice their own ideas. They are able to bring their own interests into the classrooms, in fact, they are encouraged to do so. Within this type of environment, they seek to further their own professional growth by using their local teacher center.[46]

In the United States, teacher autonomy in many areas is neither a fact nor a desired state of affairs. In enumerating the myriad of forces which are inhibiting educational change, Jwaideb and Markus present a position which depicts teachers as having little autonomy:

"Although autonomy is one of the main characteristics of the professional, teachers are not autonomous; they cannot alter the working situation as they please and, for the most part, are not free to decide what they will teach, when they will teach it, to whom, or at what price."[47]

While the statement does represent a view which inhibits innovation and change, the amount of autonomy an individual has can vary with the views of the community, the school board, the principal, and other teachers in the

---

46. Phillip Woodruff and Richard Konicek, op.cit.,pp. 15-16.
47. Jwaideb and Markus, op. cit., p. 12.

building as well as with the experience, inclination and personality of the teacher. The educational model followed in the school may determine to a large extent the degree of autonomy an individual teacher has. Especially in schools committed to informal education do teachers have more autonomy and the consequent responsibility about making decisions regarding innovations in the curriculum.

In analyzing the power of the teacher within the school setting, Edgar and Warren state that there are some areas in which the teacher generally may have little autonomy (e.g. system wide record keeping, testing, schedule involving other teachers, budget, general administrative matters) but other areas in which the teacher may have more autonomy (e.g. strategies for curriculum implementation, the tone of the classroom).[48]

The teacher's relative autonomy in the area of curriculum innovation is necessary for teachers centers to function most effectively. If teachers cannot practice the changes they feel are desirable in the classroom, involving them in center activities which foster individual curriculum development will only produce conflict with and hostility toward the back-home situation. As centers are able to have a continuing contact with teachers in their classroom settings through the advisory service

---

48. Donald E. Edgar and Richard L. Warren, "Power and Autonomy in Socialization" in Sociology of Education, Fall, 1969, p. 390.

offered by many centers, this conflict is likely to be minimized. Decision-making about classroom practices and decision-making about how teachers wish to further their own education complement each other; one without the other reduces the part either can play toward implementing educational change.

Informal Methods

The informal methods practiced in many British infant schools and supported by activities at the teachers centers have seemed particularly relevant to elementary teachers who realize the importance of children's learning through working with concrete materials rather than with books and pencils and paper alone. British pre-service as well as in-service programs have been traditionally less theoretical and more practical than their American counterpart.[49]

Curriculum developmend based on children's interests, minipulative materials, and crafts have often been emphasized in British programs and neglected in American ones. It is in particularly these three areas that American teachers are seeking to further their own competencies.[50]

American visitors to England, impressed with the success of informal methods, have sought ways to implement them in American schools. Interest has been especially

---

49. Lilian Weber, op. cit., pp. 151-152.
50. See Appendix D for a list of workshops scheduled by the centers surveyed.

keen on integrating all of the cirriculum subjects around a common theme; hence the term "integrated day". Teachers have wanted to create classroom environments in which children are actively involved in their own learning rather than passively listening. Teachers are desiring this same type of environment in order to continue their own learning.

It is to the credit of some universities (City College of New York, University of North Dakota, University of Connecticut, University of Massachusetts, University of Bridgeport, Fairfield University, University of Pittsburgh, Queens College, S.U.N.Y. at Stony Brook and the University of Toledo, to name several) that they have initiated programs which make it possible for students to gain the competencies necessary to structure an informal classroom within the requirements of a formal degree program.

It has been stated that,

> "Most universities have relatively few and indirect transactions with their external environment and are poorly staffed for gathering information about changing demands and for determining how to utilize their resources to meet these needs."[51]

The universitie cited above have bridged that gap and are involved in providing programs in informal education as well as with teachers centers in their immediate areas. By either establishing teachers centers within the university or by cooperating with teachers centers independent from the university, teacher training personnel are

---

51. Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organization, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 91

able to maintain close, continuing contact with in-service as well as pre-service teachers. The teacher center is helping the university to function more effectively as leaders in educational innovation as the university is helping teacher center programs to become recognized as legitimate, valuable professional growth experiences.

Nevertheless, the university, in isolation, remains an expensive and often geographically inaccessible institution to those already in the field. Many teachers in urban situations feel that the university could be more relevant in helping them provide programs especially geared to the needs of the child living in the inner city. Teachers who were trained at a university situated within the city may feel adequately trained, but many teachers come from universities not in touch with urban situations. The informality, the closeness, the warmth, the lack of expense, the appropriateness, and the vitality of teacher center programs have made them appeal to teachers who would not venture into a traditional university course with its application forms, high fees, registration requirements, and often dull syllaba. The U.S. teacher center and the British share a common informality, appropriateness, and ingenious use of available resources.

Teachers Centers as Change Agents

The history of in-service education in the United States recounted in Chapter II ennumerated many ways in

which traditional types of in-service programs were not effective in creating changes in classroom practices. Emphasis was placed on what unsuccessful programs do not do which results in little effective innovation.

Change theorists have looked at educational change as it occurs and have isolated principles crucial to the implementation of successful innovations.[52] These prerequisites and the ways in which teachers centers are designed to conform to them follow:

> Prerequisite 1: Schools should continually change to meet the changing society and the environment in which they are located.

The on-going nature of the teacher center and its accessibility on a year round, year after year basis puts it in a position to provide continual opportunities for professional growth and renewal. The flexible nature of the center which mechanisms built in to respond to teacher needs enables it to function in ways which are responsive to the changing society and educational priorities.

> Prerequisite 2: There ought to be a continuous interaction among the people involved in the educational process: teachers, paraprofessionals, volunteers, parents, administrators.

---

52. The following prerequisites for change are ennumerated in Schumer's work, op. cit.; the principles have been compiled by an extensive search through the literature on educational change. For a thorough explanation, see this study, pp. 25-42.

Teachers centers are able to bring together the various people involved in the educational process by providing an accessible, neutral ground for meeting. Most centers offer programs which are open to any interested person; there is no distinction between ranks or duties. The centers' basic philosophy is that all people are resources.

Prerequisite 3: There should be a continuous expansion of any complex innovation with support and training by the change agent to meet new needs as they arise.

As teachers make more and more changes in their classrooms, the center continues to be a source of support and renewal. The staff functions with the teachers as an advisory team in contact with the school situation. It is with the teachers as they grow. As center activities become supported by teachers, the centers are able to expand their services. As school systems see the ways in which the centers are able to bring about changes in the classroom, they are more willing to commit financial resources to sustaining the work of the centers.

Prerequisite 4: Teachers need to participate in planning and implementation of the programs.

Teachers centers are designed to be responsive to the needs of teachers through both formal and informal feedback mechanisms. Many centers send out questionaires asking the teachers to indicate those areas in which they

desire workshops. (The Center, Greenwich, M.A.P. Program, University of Bridgeport) Monthly meetings are held where teachers participate in the administrative decisions necessary. (The Teacher Center, New Haven) In every center, staff works with teachers in and out of the schools to keep in touch with their real needs and expressed desires. Workshop evaluations and suggestion boxes are frequently found. Especially important is the fact that centers are local institutions small enough to listen to the needs of a single individual.

Prerequisite 5: The in-service training should be held in the teachers' environment.

Workshops sponsored by the centers are very often held in schools. (The Center, Greenwich, Center for Open Education, Storrs, Greater Boston Teaching Center, Fayerweather Street School, University of Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network, The Advisory and Learning Exchange, Washington, D.C.) All centers hold at least some workshops in schools. The center themselves are located in areas generally accessible to teachers. Workshops, in some instances, need to be held at the centers because of special facilities available there, e.g., kiln, wood working machinery, dark room, etc.

Prerequisite 6: The program ought to be held over a long period of time.

Teachers centers, being on-going organizations, are able to hold programs over a long period of time. Intensive

summer workshops can be followed by drop-in sessions and additional workshops throughout the school year. Once a particular session is over, center staff is still available to help teachers with new problems and ideas as they arise. Because teachers centers are places as well as programs, teachers can return to a physical facility which does not evaporate when the session ends.

Prerequisite 7: The staff needs to operate in ways supportive to teachers.

The staff in centers functions in both formal and informal roles. In my contact with the centers and with people who have used the centers, I have continually found that center personnel are supportive, encouraging and non-threatening. Center personnel are free to support without having to supervise. Since they have no authority over the people who use the center, if they were not supportive, the people would not return.

Prerequisite 8: Attendance should be voluntary.

Except for programs which include sessions during the school day on released time (The Wednesday Program, Princeton and The Four Day Week, Unity Maine), attendance at activities is voluntary. Even these two programs offer facilities which are open to teachers on a voluntary after school basis. While attendance is voluntary, teachers are finding that they can receive in-service or graduate credit for attending sessions.

Prerequisite 9: The concepts dealt with should be appropriate and relevant to the classroom situation.

Because attendance is voluntary, teachers would not attend activities at the centers if they were not relevant and worthwhile. The titles of workshops scheduled by the centers are inviting and appealing to teachers. Teachers become more interested in their classroom and are willing to invest more of their time and energies because the activities they learn are sources of renewed enthusiasm.

Prerequisite 10: The method of training needs to be consistent with the teacher's own preferred style of training.

In centers specifically advocating open education, those teachers who use the facilities probably are trying to structure informal learning situations in their classroom. Because attendance is voluntary, teachers are able to go where they feel comfortable. Centers usually offer a wide range of activities from which teachers can choose. Most teachers, if they are willing to invest the time, will find some offering in which they can become interested. But the teacher center is an alternative to traditional forms of in-service education. The traditional forms still exist. Those teachers who prefer university courses, courses given at art centers, or school system in-service courses are free to go where they choose. Teachers centers are meant to supplement rather than replace those opportunities for in-service growth available in the past.

Summary

The teacher center in America brings with it a new attitude about the freedom and the responsibility a teacher can exercise in the classroom. Because there is more freedom, the teacher can make decisions and is more apt to bring greater energy into the classroom. The teacher is able to see that such efforts are rewarded and that they do make a difference in children's learning.

A recent article on in-service education predicts that,

> "in-service education of the future will not be seen as 'shaping' teachers but rather will be viewed as aiding, supporting and encouraging each teacher's development of those teaching capabilities that he values and seeks to enhance."[53]

The teacher center is especially suited to function in this manner.

---

53. Ralph W. Tyler, "In-Service Education of Teachers: A Look at the Past and the Future" in Louis J. Rubin, ed., Improving In-Service Education, Proposals and Procedures for Change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 15.

CHAPTER III

THE SURVEY

Methodology

Instrument Preparation

In order to obtain information about the establishment and operation of teachers centers, a questionaire was developed and sent out dealing with ten areas of interest. (Appendix A) The preliminary questionaire was revised according to suggestions made by Dr. Masha Rudman and Dr. Richard Konicek in January, 1973. A cover letter was added. The Education Department at the New York Botanical Garden, where I worked from 1972-1973, under the guidance of Mr. John Reed, printed the blank forms and the cover letter and mailed out the questionaires during February and March, 1973.[1]

The questionaire sought answers to questions about the goals, staffing patterns, fiscal arrangement, educational programs, methods of communicating center activities, affiliation with other organizations, years in existence, decision-making processes, community involvement, and physical facilities.

Selection of Sites

Since a relatively small number of centers exist which have been identified as programs in which the teachers

---

1. I planned and conducted in-service teacher education activities at the Garden from June, 1972 - July, 1973.

are involved in the decision-making processes, the questionaire was sent to every center which could be identified. A list was compiled from Scholastic Teacher's Guide to Teacher Centers, from the Greater Boston Teacher Center's Workshops for Teachers, Fall and Winter 1972-1973, from a list of resource centers which could be used by teachers in New York City compiled by Museums Collaborative, Inc., and from informal sources.

Certainly the list was incomplete and did not include centers started after the published lists were printed or those of which any of the authors of the lists were unaware. Nevertheless, the list does include centers from all over the United States, those funded by school systems and private foundations, those sponsored by museums and universities, and those funded by combinations thereof--all of which have been identified as teachers centers.

Time and Collection of Data

The questionaires were returned to the Botanical Garden between March and May, 1973. A second letter and a duplicate copy of the questionaire was sent to those centers which had not responded by the middle of April. Forty-two (42) out of fifty-nine (59) centers or 71% of those centers surveyed returned the questionaire. Most sent additional materials which added depth to the data supplied in the answers to the questionaire. In three

cases, centers did not respond fully to the questionaire, but enclosed their literature which enabled the questionaires to be completed by the author culled from the materials they had sent. The answers to the questions posed, the materials sent by the centers, and the author's visit to fifteen centers form the basis for the information and the analysis presented in this chapter.

Method of Collation

From June through August, 1973, the completed questionaires were reviewed. The responses to the questions were collated. Tables were prepared and charts made to give a visual representation of the information. Generally the information is reported as raw data as well as percentage of centers surveyed in each given area. In one instance, the goals for being established, the full response to the question is found in Appendix C.

Reporting of Results

The results of the various methods used to obtain information about the operation and establishment of the centers is reported in the following categories:

1. Goals and Reasons for Being Established
2. Time in Operation
3. Fiscal Arrangements
4. Staffing Complement
5. Physical Facilities
6. Educational Programs
7. Communication of Center Activities
8. Affiliation with Other Organizations
9. Decision-Making Processes
10. Community Involvement

Included along with a report of the responses to each of the questions asked is a summary of the major findings in each area and the effect this might have on the centers' abilities to implement innovations which are structured to promote better learning experiences for the children.

Goals

1. Why was your center started?
2. What is the stated goal of your center?

Educators continue to be asked about the goals of their work. In asking these questions, the survey attempted to ascertain why each center was established. The responses to the above questions indicate that the original goals, i.e., those reasons given for establishing the center, and the stated goals are most often identical. In several cases, the centers replied, "See Question 1" to Question 2.

The answers to Questions 1 and 2 have been blended and can be found in Appendix C. The responses fell into four categories: 1) curriculum innovation, particularly in open education, 2) general in-service and pre-service teacher education, 3) general resource center and 4) a central agency to provide expensive services. Most

centers stressed that personal as well as professional growth in all of the areas delineated above is an important goal of the center. Regardless of which area the centers said was their main area of concern, all centers placed the responsibility for personal and professional growth, in large measure, on the shoulders of the individual teacher with the center acting as a resource rather than as a director.

Those centers which belong in each of the four categories mentioned above can be found listed in Table I.

Table 1

LIST OF CENTERS ACCORDING TO THEIR GOALS

List of Centers According to the Major Area of Their Concern

Curriculum Innovation Particular to Open Education

1. Workshop for Open Education, New York City
2. Mountain View Teachers Center, Boulder
3. The Teacher Center, New Haven
4. Teachers' Active Learning Center, San Francisco
5. The Center, Greenwich
6. Durham Parent-Teacher Center, Philadelphia
7. Community Resources, New York City
8. The Center for Open Education, Storrs
9. Teacher Interactive Learning Center, Hartford
10. Fayerweather Street School, Cambridge
11. Store Front Learning Center, Boston
12. Greater Boston Teachers Center
13. Early Childhood Training Center, Hartford
14. District Six Advisory Center, Philadelphia
15. Environmental Studies Project, Boulder
16. Curriculum Workshop, Brattleboro
17. Workshop for Learning Things, Cambridge
18. Creative Environment Learning Center,Los Angeles
19. Advisory and Learning Exchange, Washington, D.C.

General In-Service and Pre-Service Teacher Education

1. Teacher Training Complex, S.U.N.Y.,Bay Shore
2. The Wednesday Program, Pittsburgh
3. M.A.P.Program, University of Bridgeport
4. Regional Teacher Center for Northwest Ohio,Toledo
5. Wheelock College Resource Center, Boston
6. University of Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network
7. Wave Hill Center for Environmental Education,The Bronx
8. Urban Resources Program, New York City
9. Four Day Week Program, Unity,Maine
10. Training Program for Teachers in the Technologies, Morgantown, W. Va.
11. Teacher Renewal Center, Boise
12. The Teachers, Inc., New York City
13. Dallas Educational Renewal Center
14. Teacher Training Complex, Appalachian State University, Boone, No. Carolina
15. New England Center for Occupational Education, Newton Learning Institute of North Carolina, Durham

(Table 1 continued next page)

Table 1 continued

General Resource Center

1. The Basement Workshop, New York City
2. The Studio Museum in Harlem
3. The Children's Museum, Boston
4. New England Craftsmanship Center, Boston
5. High Rock Nature Center, New York City
6. Community Environment, Inc., New York City

Central Agency to Provide Expensive Services

1. Regional Enrichment Center, Kalamazoo

Table 2, presented below, colates the reasons given for establishing and operating the centers and provides the actual numbers and percentages.[2] The number of centers whose goal is either in-service education or in-service education in open education is 35 centers or 83% of all centers surveyed.

Table 2

STATED GOALS OF TEACHER CENTERS BY CATEGORY

Goal	Number of Centers	% of Total
Curriculum innovation, particularly in open education	19	46
General in-service and/or pre-service education	16	38
General Resource Center	6	14
Central Agency to Provide Expensive Services	1	2
	42	100

Those centers which are listed as general resource centers are facilities which teachers use but which are used by people in the community at large as well. These centers are most often sections of museums. While teachers do not have considerable input into the decision-making

2. Percentages have been rounded out to the nearest whole in all of the tables.

process of the larger institution of which the teacher center is a part, the centers report that teachers are involved in those aspects of the institutions which affect them.

Teachers centers were started as an alternative to or a supplement to the traditional course route of in-service, pre-service education whether sponsored under the auspices of a university, the school district, the single school, the city or federal government or an educational organization. The reasons given for being started stress the teacher's active involvement and participation rather than passive absorption. All programs recognize the teacher's need to continue to grow after entering the classroom; they stress that in-service education is as crucial, if not more crucial, than pre-service education toward furthering the most complete professional growth possible. Centers recognize the need for a variety of programs from which interested participants can choose. They want to be responsible to all who are involved in the educational process -- teachers, volunteers, para-professionals, parents, administrators. They try to establish programs taking into account what the teachers' desire. On the whole, attendance at teacher center functions is voluntary, and therefore, the centers must be attuned to teacher interests in order to gain attendance.

As the literature has stated, the most effective education occurs when the participants have some choice about what they are learning; choice means commitment. Programs are geared to help the participants become the most responsible person in their own learning process. By choosing to come to a center activity, teachers and para-professionals have already shown that they have made some steps in assuming this responsibility. Teachers centers view themselves as an adjunct in the process of helping teachers continue their learning rather than as a repository of the right methods for educating children.

What is especially noteworthy is not the centers' statements about teachers' active involvement and participation, but the fact that teachers are actively involved and do participate. The administrators of centers are continually in contact with teachers in order to formulate programs in accordance with teachers' feelings.

Centers Designed to Support Information Education

Centers designed for open education combine two strategies to effect change. One strategy, using change as a problem-solving approach, stresses teacher initiated, directed and evaluated change. The other strategy, based on change as brought about through diffusion, seeks to spread informal methods through center staff members as resource agents.

The diffusion theory states that change involves four elements: 1) the innovation, 2) its communication through certain channels, 3) over time, and 4) among the members of a social system.[3]

Open education centers bring together the innovation (i.e. teachers implementing informal techniques in their classrooms, center staff with skills and expertise in informal methodologies, books and articles, commercial and teacher-made materials, and materials and space for teachers to use to make learning materials to bring back into the classroom).

Fellow teachers and center staff communicate on an informal basis as well as in workshops, deepening the teachers' understanding and skills in ways particularly appropriate to open classroom teaching.

Teachers centers are year round operations. They are available to support teachers on an on-going basis. They continue to act as a resource center after a workshop or a summer session ends. Center staff supports teachers through the time necessary to implement long lasting change; teachers have the time to learn to rely on each other for support.

The informality of the centers encourages exchange among all who use the facilities. Teachers who have communicated little with their colleages before can learn

---

3. Jwaideb and Markus, op. cit.,pp. 21-25.

to share in a non-threatening atmosphere. As they become more secure in the methods they are learning, they begin to share their ideas and their enthusiasm with other teachers.

Thus the teacher center is designed to be a particularly effective vehicle to implement change and bring about the goal of supporting teachers in curriculum innovation in their classroom.

Summary of Goals of Teachers Centers

Teachers centers were started for the purpose of in-service education. Almost half of the centers were started to support teachers as they began to use informal practices in their classrooms. These centers are used primarily by elementary school teachers because of the need of young children to learn through working with materials. Traditionally much teacher education has been theoretical and has provided teachers of young children with limited experience in creating materials for the children to use or in using objects found in the environment to facilitate learning.

About a third of the centers want to provide in-service opportunities but haveno special thrust. Most often, the workshops scheduled reveal that they,too,are designed primarily for the elementary school teacher.

Only occasionally is a course geared to the secondary school teacher.[4]

The literature sent by the centers, as well as the statements given, show that the centers are concerned with the teacher's personal as well as professional growth and that the centers value participant initiated, directed, and evaluated programs of their own choosing.

Time in Operation - Use of the Centers

3. How many years has the center been in operation?
4. How many people used the center last year?

Most centers which responded to the survey were established within the past three years. This corresponds to foundation interest in supporting centers designed to support innovations in open education and federal funding for educational innovations under Title III. Twenty-seven out of forty-two centers (64%) are less than four years old as is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

LENGTH OF TIME IN OPERATION

	Years in Operation										
	under 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	over 9
Number of Centers	8	6	2	11	3	4	2	3	1	1	0

4. See Appendix D for titles of workshops listed in the materials sent by the centers.

The growth in the number of centers since 1970 parallels the interest in British informal education and British teacher centers. The Plowden Report was issued in 1967; it took three years for a sufficient number of people to visit the British schools and to organize ways to finance the initial funding of teachers centers in the U. S. Table 4 shows the centers grouped by years in operation in 1973.

Table 4

CENTERS GROUPED BY YEARS IN OPERATION BY 1973

	Years		
	3 or less	4-8	over 8
No. of Centers	27	14	2
% of Total	62	33	5

Most centers ask visitors to sign guest books so that they can keep track of how many people use the centers as well as to determine from which schools or locales teachers who use the facilities come. Keeping a record of how many people use the center is a way centers are able to justify their existence and receive funding.

A question was asked to find out if centers were organized so that a certain number of people could be served. But no trend emerged as to how many people use a given facility as can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5

NUMBER OF VISITORS TO THE CENTERS IN 1972-1973

	No. of Visitors					
	under 100	100-300	300-500	500-1,000	1,000-3,000	over 3,000
No. of Centers	2*	4	3	5	5	9#

Unknown, no answer, or under a year in operation: 11

* Both centers are in their first year.
\# Three out of these 9 are museums.

The responses to the question asking the number of people who used the center last year are, at best, close estimates. Some centers reported that they did not keep a record of how many people used their facilities.

Nevertheless, between 36,000, calculating by the lower number in each range, or 49,000, calculating by the higher number in each range, made use of the centers in 1972-1973. Figuring that eleven centers are not included in this count, the number of people who have used the centers is substantial, especially considering the fact that attendance at most centers is on a voluntary rather than a mandatory basis.

Further research is needed to estimate the number of people who use teachers centers as compared with the total number of people in the individual school system and with other methods of in-service education. These comparative

figures are needed in order to make conclusions about the impact of the centers on the total professional population of a system.

Summary of Use of Teacher Centers and Years in Operation

Most centers have been started within the last three years and are, therefore, a recent development, in the history of in-service education. The increase in the number of centers within the last three years has been due to increased interest in support to informal methods in elementary education and to interest in supporting a method of in-service education in which teachers take a major role in assuming the responsibility for their own education.

The significance of how many people use the centers cannot be estimated until more research is conducted comparing the number of teachers who use teachers centers with the number who use other methods of in-service education and with the number of professionals in a given school system.

Fiscal Arrangements

5. What was your original source of funding?
__foundation __gov't grant __school board
__teachers

6. What is your present source of funding?
__foundation __gov't grant __school board
__teachers

Initial Funding

The key to the stability of any institution over a long period of time depends on its funding source. These questions about funding sources were asked in order to determine if funds were coming from sources which would be likely to continue in the future or whether they were from a source which would not be available after a short period of time. School board and university funding sources seem to be the most stable over a period of time. The questions were also asked to determine if most centers are relying on a single source for their support or whether they are able to obtain funds from a variety of sectors. Obtaining funds from a variety of sources would imply that the centers needed to be responsive to all sources rather than to a single factor.

Table 6 lists the original sources of funds for the centers.

Table 6

ORIGINAL SOURCES OF FUNDING

Single Funding Source: 25 centers (53% of total)

Type of Funding	No. of Centers	% of Total
Foundation	10	24
Government Brant	12	29
School Board		
Teacher Supported		2+
Membership Dues	1	2+
Community Organization	1	2+
University	1	2+
	25	53%

Combined Funding Sources: 13 centers (33% of total)

Type of Funding	No. of Centers	% of Total
Gov't Grant/School Board	4	10
Foundation/Gov't Grant	2	5
Foundation/Teacher Supported	1	2+
Membership Dues/Loans	1	2+
University/Foundation	1	2+
University/Gov't Grant	1	2+
Teacher Supported/University	1	2+
Foundation/City Taxes/School District	1	2+
Foundation/Gov't Grant/School Board	1	2+
	13	30%

No answer: 2 centers

There are several interesting facts about original funding sources shown in the data. First, two thirds of the centers were funded by a single source originally. Title III funding accounted for the largest single source of initial funds for the centers. The Ford Foundation was also instrumental in establishing several of the centers.

The Ford Foundation provided money for pilot centers to create models different from each other and responsive to the particular needs of the communities in which they were situated. Only one center was started with support solely from a school board.

In analyzing the data on that third of the centers which received initial funding from several sources, no conclusion can be drawn about the most common combination of combined funds. Ten out of the fourteen centers had combinations different from any other. Even in the case of combined funds, school boards supported only four out of fourteen efforts: the same was true of university support.

It is important to look at university and school support of teachers centers because these two institutions present the most stable source of funding possibilities. Yet is it seen that neither of these sources contributed to the support of a majority of the centers as either a sole support of funds or as a contributor of funds. This also illustrates that the initiative for starting the centers did not come from school boards of from universities. They contributed to partial funding in eight out of forty-two centers and to the complete funding of two out of forty-two centers.

Summary of Original Sources of Funding

Two thirds of the centers received funds from a single source whereas one third received their initial money from combined sources. Foundations and government grants were the sole means of support for half the centers and contributed to the partial support of an additional eight centers. In assessing the likelihood of the continuing existence of teachers centers, it is important to take into account that university and school board support as a sole or partial means of support contributed to the initial funding of less than one quarter of the centers. In order for centers to become stable institutions, it seems that more support from these two sectors needs to be forthcoming.

Funding During 1972-1973

Table 7 on sources of funding during 1972-1973 shows a shift in funding once the initial period ended. Of the eight centers started after September, 1972, three centers have already experienced a change in their funding source: one from government grant to government grant plus school board support; one from foundation to foundation plus teacher support (workshop fees); and one from loans plus workshop fees to workshop fees alone.

Table 7 shows that as centers have continued in operation, more of them have been able to find several sources of financial support. School board and university

support has also increased. In 1972-1973, school boards were the sole support of three centers (an additional two centers since the initial funding period) and contributed to the support of six centers, an increase of three centers. While the increase is not great, the trend is important.

Table 7

FUNDING SOURCES 1972-1973

Single Funding Sources: 18 centers (43% of Total)

Type of Funding	No. of Centers	% of Total
Gov't Grant	6	14
Teacher Supported	4	10
Foundation	3	7
School Board	3	7
University	2	5
	18	43%

Combined Funding Sources: 22 centers (57% of total)

Type of Funding	No. of Centers	% of Total
Gov't Grant/School Board	8	19
Foundation/Teacher Supported	3	7
Foundation/School Board/Teacher Supported	2	5
University/Foundation	1	2+
Foundation/Gov't Grant	1	2+
University/Gov't Grant	1	2+
University/Teacher Supported	1	2+
University/School Board	1	2+
University/School Board/Gov't Grant	1	2+
Foundation/School Board/Gov't Grant	1	2+
Foundation/Gov't Grant/Dues	1	2+
Foundation/City Budget	1	2+
	22	49%

In looking at university support of teachers centers, the other avenue of more stable funds, universities in 1972-1973 were the sole support of two centers. This represents an increase of one since the initial funding period. Universities also contributed to the support of five others. This is an increase of two centers since the initial funding period. Again the extent of the increase is not great, but the trend is important.

What is more marked is the shift from reliance on a single source for funding during the initial period (53% of the centers) during subsequent periods (43% during 1972-1973). Two types of single source funding has disappeared entirely, support from a community organization and from membership dues alone. In the former case, funding support which originally came from the Parent Child Guidance Clinic, Inc. came from teachers during 1972-1973 (The Creative Environment Learning Center). In the latter case, membership dues did not cover the cost of running the center and support was obtained through a foundation and a government grant. (The Basement Workship, New York City)

The variety of combinations of sources of support increased from ten different combinations during the initial funding period to twelve types during 1972-1973.

Foundations provided the sole source of initial funds for ten centers with the belief that other sources of support would be forthcoming if the centers prove worthwhile. In fact, centers which relied on foundations as their sole

support initially, have been able to expand their bases. This is shown in Table 8, Relationship Between Years in Operation and Funding Source.

Table 8

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YEARS IN OPERATION AND TYPE OF FUNDING SOURCE

Years in Operation	Centers Using Combined Sources	Centers Using Single Sources
Under 4	16	11
4 and over	11	4

The centers were grouped in two categories to determine if funding for older centers is different from the funding of centers started more recently. Table 9 shows that while more centers in each age group rely on multiple sources, centers over four years rely on multiple sources in a 3:1 ratio; whereas, newer centers are about evenly divided between using multiple and single sources.

Summary of Findings of 1972-1973 Funding Sources

Centers are relying increasingly on multiple sources of financial support. There has been a slight increase in the support contributed by school boards and universities. This is an important trend to watch, as these institutions represent the most stable source of funds currently used by

teachers centers. There is also a trend to rely on multiple sources as a center is longer established. Many more centers are affiliated with universities and school systems than receive funds from them as can be seen by looking at Tables 22 and 23 on affiliation, graduate, and in-service credit.

Revenue Through Teacher Suppors

7. Do workshop fees cover the cost of running the workshops?
8. Does your center have a general membership fee and, if so,how much is it?

There are two schools of thought about whether or not centers should charge teachers who come to workships at the centers. Ideally, centers feel that if teachers give their time to come to the centers, they should be able to use the facilities free. One point of view is that, in addition to teachers not having to pay workshop fees, they ought to be reimbursed for the time they are spending at the center. Center personnel is afraid that this might bring teachers to the centers who are not interested in the programs and, therefore, diminish the usual enthusiasm and support-building found when people come to the centers voluntarily. Teachers, on the other hand, who have worked in areas without teacher centers, often do not mind paying the small fee required by the centers and are happy that such a facility is available, accessible, and not exorbitant in cost. Schools sometimes reimburse teachers for workshop fees out of P.T.A. or discretionary funds.

Question 7 was asked to determine if fees alone could cover the cost of running a workshop. The responses are reported in Table 9. Only one fourth of the centers report that fees do cover workshop expenses. In 60% of the centers, workshop fees are not charged or do not pay for the workshops. Five centers did not answer this question.

Table 9

WORKSHOP FEES COVERING THE COST OF A WORKSHOP

Coverage	No. of Centers	% of Total
Fees Cover the Cost	11	26
Fees Do Not Cover the Cost	20	48
No Fees are Charged	6	14
No Answer	5	12
	42	100%

As Table 9 shows, fees cover the cost of running a workshop in only one-fourth of the centers. In those cases where workshop fees do cover the expenses of a workshop, the overhead expenditures still remain. The fees charged cannot offset the expenses of staffing, space, materials, supplies, publicity, and the services of an advisory. It seems impossible, therefore, for centers to be self-sustaining agencies. They must rely on outside funding through universities, government grants, foundations, and, more and more, through school boards. The revenues received by charging workshop fees provide only a small part of the center's operating budgets.

Most centers do not have a general membership fee. Those centers which do charge a membership fee are those connected with museums, e.g. The Children's Museum, The Basement Workshop, and the Studio Museum in Harlem. Membership fees charged by the centers were as follows: $25.00/year, $2.30/child in the local school district paid for by the school board, $24.00/year, $50.00/year or $5.00/session, $30.00/term and $10.00/year.

No general membership fee is charged by thirty-four centers (81% of all). A membership fee is charged by seven centers (17% of all). One center did not respond to that question. The policy that teachers should pay to belong to the centers is not found. The consensus is that if teachers put in their time and interest, outside of minimal workshop fees, other sources can be found to support the centers' on-going administrative activities and physical facilities.

Summary of Revenues Through Teacher Support

While teachers' financial support of the centers does not supply enough income to pay for the centers' overhead expenses, workshop fees do pay for bringing consultants to the centers and for some materials teachers use during the workshops.

The question of whether or not teachers ought to be able to use the centers free of all charges is debated as an ideal principle. The reality is that two thirds of the

centers do charge teachers a workshop fee, even if the revenue thus collected does not totally pay for running the workshop. Teachers used to using centers free of charge would probably balk if workshop fees were established; teachers who have not had the availability of a center in their area would probably be glad to pay the fee in order to get the services of a center, provided they feel that in-service education through a center would be the most appropriate form of in-service education.

Free Services

9. Please check those services you offer without charge: __workshops __library __in-school teacher training __advisory service __newsletter __informal meetings __inspection of resource materials __other (specify).

Most centers regard themselves as having three major functions. 1) They are places where teachers can come to participate in workshops. 2) They supply an advisory staff which helps teachers with particular concerns on an individual or school-wide basis. 3) They house libraries and resource centers for commercial and teacher-made materials which the teachers can inspect and, sometimes, borrow. All of these activities are for relaxation and an exchange of ideas which are the foundation for the kind of professional and personal growth the centers strive to facilitate. In order to achieve this sharing of ideas, many centers offer their services without charge. Table 10 shows which services are free.

Table 10

FREE SERVICES

Type of Service	No. Offering Service	% of Total
Informal Meetings	37	88
Advisory Service	34	81
Resource Center	34	81
Library	26	61
Workshops	26	61
Newsletter	26	61
In-School Teacher Training	25	59
On Site Classroom Design	13	31
All of the above	9	21

No answer: 1

Misc. replies: films, conferences, presentations, seminars, working with parents and technical assistance

Table 10 reveals that most of the services offered by centers are doing so without charge, with the exception of workshops. In some cases, centers do not offer free services because they do not offer the service at all.

The exact significance of the replies to Question 9 are difficult to assess. Those centers which are funded by school systems probably would offer the most free services, but generally they are open only to teachers who might work in that particular system. In Philadelphia, The Durham Center and the District Six Advisory Center both are funded by government grants. However, they have arranged a full schedule for Day Care Services and are reimbursed for doing so. Head Start staff can go to the workshops free of charge on a space availability basis. If Head Start wants to use

the centers as part of their own staff development program, the centers charge a fee. But individual staff members may come to workships normally scheduled by the centers without charge. The issue of whether the services are free or not free is complicated in Philadelphia and, probably, elsewhere as well.

If the centers are rigid in permitting some teachers to come free but in charging others, this would probably discourage fee paying teachers from participating. An interchange among teachers working in private, public and parochial schools and among teachers in different federally funded programs might be discouraged by giving priority in space as well as free participation in the workshop. In those centers which are affiliated with universities, students enrolled at the university or supervising a student teacher from the university might be able to come to the center without charge, but those who are not so involved might be less welcome or have to pay for attending workshops. Paying course fees to participate in workshops is an expense teachers with degrees might not want to incur. Further research is needed on whether fee or enrollment policies are discriminating against teachers who might want to use the centers but who do not meet certain criteria set by the centers.

In practice, I have found that while certain policies exists on paper, workshops held within universities and those sponsored by particular programs are open to any person on a

space availability basis. In some instances, lower fees are charged teachers who come from affiliated schools.

Summary of Free Services

The majority of services offered by centers are free with the exception of workshops. Even these are open without charge in over half of the centers. The issue of discrimination among participants because they are not affiliated with a certain program could prove to be a devisive force and bears watching by center personnel.

Summary of Fiscal Arrangements

Most centers operate on small budgets yet offer their services to those who come without charge or for a small charge for attending workshops.

The lack of financial support by school boards and universities, the institutions with the most stable funding sources, endangers the continued existence of teachers centers over a long period of time. If centers are able to increase their support from these two sources, without having to curtail the role of teachers in the decision-making processes of the centers, their continued existence becomes more likely. While teachers may give strong support to the centers in terms of attending center functions, they are unable to support the centers financially; thus, the centers need to look to sources other than teachers for their financial support.

Centers have been expanding their sources of support to include several factors. This is a healthy state, as centers are designed to be responsive to all who are interested in making the educational process more effective.

In terms of the centers acting as a change agent, the fact that the burden of financial support does not fall upon those who use the centers acts as an incentive encouraging participation. Workshop fees are usually much lower than tuition charges at universities. Teachers are able to receive in-service credit for attending as an additional incentive in those systems offering in-service credit.

Staffing Complement

10. What is the size of your staff?
    Full time: __administrative-professional
    __clerical __custodial
    Part time: __administrative-professional
    __clerical __custodial

Most of the centers' staff consists of professional personnel. In both part time and full time staff, 75% and 69% of the centers respectively, those in administrative positions assumed clerical as well as custodial responsibilities. Few centers had custodial help. This can be seen as a sheer budget necessity but also as reflective of the trend in centers to share jointly in housekeeping and maintenance responsibilities--whether one is a teacher, an administrator, a parent, a student or a paraprofessional.

Roughly one third of the centers use part time staff instead of, or in addition to,full time personnel. This is especially true when it comes to leading workshops. Many centers hire consultants, including teachers in the area and community resource personnel, as specialists, to give workshops. These consultants are not listed when the centers ennumerate their staff because they are not with the center on a regular basis.

Table 11 shows the staffing complement of the centers. The majority of centers have small professional and even smaller clerical staffs. Custodial staffs are almost non-existent.

Table 11

STAFFING COMPLEMENT

Full Time Staff

	People in Centers						
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	over 8	total	% of staff
Administrative-Professional Staff	17	5	9	3	3[1]	201	75%
Clerical Staff	16	2	2	0	1	48	18%
Custodial Staff	5	0	0	0	1	17	7%
						266	100%

Part Time Staff

	People in Centers						
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	over 8	total	% of staff
Administrative-Professional Staff	13	6	2	1	4[2]	108	69%
Clerical Staff	16	1	0	0	1	32	21%
Custodial	10	1	0	0	0	16	10%
						156	100%

1. Full time professional staff of over eight people, Store Front Learning Center (20), New England Center for Occupational Education (2), and the Learning Institute of North Carolina (52). The Learning Institute also employs 6 cooks.

2. Part time professional staff of over eight people: High Rock Nature Center (22), Training Program for Teachers in The Technologies (9), Regional Teacher Center for Northwest Ohio (10), and The Advisory for Open Education (9).

No answer: 2 centers

other teachers, an openness that is sometimes not extended to outsiders or those considered to be in an "ivory tower",

As center personnel are change agents, it is highly advantageous, in terms of change theory, that the staff be former teachers, sometimes on sabbatical leave or on loan from a school system with the intent of returning to the classroom.

The diffusion theory of change holds that,

"a change agent is a person who is similar to the audience in background and viewpoints. The change agent should have a high degree of technical knowledge or expertise, as well as an ability to analyze the individual variables. Further, the change agent should have highly developed social skills and an ability to develop and maintain effective interpersonal relationships with members of the client system."[5]

In all of my visits to teachers centers and in my discussions with people who have used the centers, I have continually found center staffs to exemplify these characteristics.

As Goodlad has stated,

"The concept of teachers helping each other in individual and in staff development has scarcely been exploited. Teachers learn a great deal from the demands of teaching each other and take readily to instruction by peers, with whose experience they can readily identify."[6]

Thus, center staffs do seem to fulfill the basic requirements to act as successful change agents according to change theory.

---

5. Jwaideb and Markus, op.cit., p.45.
6. John I. Goodlad, "Staff Development and the League Model" In Theory into Practice, Vol. XI, No. 4, Dec., 1972, pp. 212-213.

By reviewing center publications announcing scheduled workshops, it is found that teachers teaching in the community are the most frequent sources of workshop leaders. Sometimes the workshops are held in these teachers' or other teachers' classrooms rather than at the centers.

The following centers all make extensive use of teachers as workshop leaders: The Advisory and Learning Exchange, the Greater Boston Teacher Center, The Center for Open Education in Storrs, The Multiple Alternatives Program, The Center in Greenwich, The Workshop in Open Education at City College, The District Six Advisory Center, The Durham Parent-Teacher Center, The Wave Hill Center for Environmental Education, the Fayerweather Street School, and the Teacher Interactive Learning Center all make extensive use of teachers as workshop leaders.

The use of teachers as workshop leaders helps make the centers a successful change agent. Teachers in the field are able to relate their practical experiences to other teachers. Teachers who actually do what they advocate give great credibility to what they say. Using teachers rather than university professors brings the cost of workshops down, as teachers charge less for their services. The opportunity for practicing teachers to lead in-service courses furthers their own professionalgrowth and gives them the chance to be recognized for the fine work they are doing with children. Finally, there is a willingness for teachers to listen to

In acting as change agents, I have seen center staffs function effectively between encouraging people to find their own solutions to their own problems and supplying expertise needed in certain situations. Center staffs, especially staffs working in centers for informal education may find a conflict in this dual role.

Open education theory and change seen as a problem-solving process stress that it is the teacher who initiates, plans, implements, and evaluates the innovations; the change agent is a facilitator or a consultant in the process. Other change theorists view change agents as having expert knowledge and the ability to apply the innovation in a more constructive way than can the teachers. This view holds that the teachers need the change agent because they are incompetent to implement the innovation themselves.[7] Center staffs are constantly faced with the dilemna of knowing how much of their expertise to transmit and how much the teachers should discover on their own with gentle prods and pushes. The most effective change agents are probably those who are able to perform these dual functions in the appropriate situation.

---

7. Neal Gross, Joseph B. Giacquinta, and Marilyn Bernstein, "The Literature on Planned Organizational Change: A Critical Appraisal", in Implementing Organizational Innovations, (New York: Basic Books, 1971), p. 24.

Summary of the Findings on Staffing Complement

Most centers have a small professional staff with a smaller clerical staff if, in fact, they have any clerical staff at all. Custodial help is almost non-existent. The regular full time or part time administrative staff is supplemented by workshop leaders who function as consultants. Very often these are teachers practicing in the local area.

Teachers and former teachers are able to function particularly well as change agents. They come from a background similar to that of those who use the center's services. They relate well to people and seem to have the ability to know when to call upon their expertise in skill areas and when to act as a supportive guide and consultant.

Physical Facilities

The existence of a physical facility to house a teacher center is important because much of the learning that takes place in a center happens informally. The exchange among teachers and between teachers and center personnel frequently occurs in a casual way rather than in a structured formal session. Without some type of physical facility in which a relaxed atmosphere can be created, this type of exchange is impossible.

In most teachers centers, financial support was obtained to pay staff as administrators and as advisors.

to pay for a physical facility in which to hold activities, and to pay for additional resource personnel to lead workshops. Three of the centers which responded to the survey indicate that they were started as extensive programs with a limited physical facility, but that this facility has been able to expand as the program has matured. The Wednesday Program in Princeton, New Jersey and the Four Day School Week in Unity, Maine both conduct in-service training sessions on released time for all teachers in the system. As such, during this time, the program has the use of all the buildings in the system. Both of these programs now report that they have offices,rooms for making materials, and rooms for informal meetings available throughout the week. In these two cases, the development of a physical facility which can be used informally has been the outgrowth of an effective program rather than the other way around.

The other center, which developed a physical facility as a result of an effective program, is the Workshop for Open Education at City College. Here, City College had organized an advisory team which supported teachers as they began to use informal methods in the Open Corridor Program in New York City. After several years of operation, the advisory was able to establish a teachers center as a place in the fall of 1973.

11. Check which of the following facilities is available at the center:
social lounge__ kitchen__ administrative offices__ printing shop__ space for making materials__ library__ audio-visual equipment__ scrounge center__ large meeting room__ display of commercial materials__ display of teacher made materials__ other__ (please specify)

Question 11 was included in the survey in order to determine the types of physical facilities found in the centers. The range in facilities is substantial. The released time programs, mentioned previously, used the facilities of the entire school system in addition to a room for making materials, a couple of social lounges, and the administrative offices. Other centers were housed in attic lofts (The Creative Teaching Workshop, Manhattan), parts of schools (The Curriculum Workshop, The University of Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network, The Teacher Interactive Learning Center, The Early Childhood Training Center, The Durham Parent-Teachers Center), manor houses (Multiple Alternatives Program, Wave Hill Center for Environmental Education), church basements (The Teacher Center, New Haven), unused schools (District Six Advisory Center), garage lofts (The Center, Greenwich), office buildings (Environmental Studies Project), museums (The Children's Museum, The Studio Museum in Harlem), administration buildings and on university premises. The Fayerweather Street School said the whole community provided the learning facility for the program. In my experience at a workshop

held there and in reading brochures for subsequent workshops held there, this is the case.

The types of services provided in the centers is reported in Table 12.

Table 12

TYPES OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES AVAILABLE IN THE CENTERS

Type of Facility	No. of Centers Having the Facility
Administrative Offices	32
Library	31
Large Meeting Rooms	31
Audio-Visual Room	30
Space for Making Materials	30
Display of Commercial Materials	27
Display of Teacher-Made Materials	25
Scrounge Center	24
Social Lounge	18
Kitchen or Cooking Facilities	17
Printing Shop	8
Dark Room	6
Woodworking Shop	4
Movement Space	3
Math Room	3
Science Room	3
Ceramics Studio	2
Tri-Wall Shop	2
Arts and Crafts Area	2
Classrooms Set up As Open Classrooms	2

No answer: 3 centers

Also listed once: Display of Children's Work, Lending Library of Commercial Materials, Auditorium, Outside Roofed Shelters, Self-Instructional Lab, Simulation Lab, Testing Lab, Artist-in-Residence Studios, Collection of Museum Artifacts which may be borrowed and a Video-Tape Studio.

In addition to the special rooms or areas for particular crafts (e.g. silk screen workshop, weaving studio), the facilities available are attractive enough that teachers come to the centers on a voluntary basis after school hours or on the weekends. Each of the facilities listed contributes to the functioning characteristic to teachers centers.

Facilities for Socialization

Almost half of the centers have a kitchen or a place to cook and serve refreshments. Informal exchange is fostered by food or, as the English say, "by a cup of tea". People are able to relax after a day's teaching before becoming active again. Those who come to the center are made to feel especially welcome by a light refreshment. The kitchens also provide the opportunity for developing cooking activities for the classroom although these often are done without a stove and even without an electric frying pan, hot plate or toaster oven.

Centers have social lounges (18 centers), as well as large meeting rooms (31), where those who come to the center can meet and greet each other. These large spaces, in addition to being available for meetings, can provide space for films and movement. Sometimes a large room is divided into smaller spaces and set up as an open classroom (The Creative Teaching Center). It is common for multiple uses to be made of a single space.

Facilities to Help Teachers to Work with Materials

Three quarters of the centers (30 centers) have space where teachers can make materials to bring back into the classroom. One center encourages parents to come to make materials to use with their children at home (The Durham Parent Teacher Center). Centers operate on the premise that teachers may begin their education with the materials found at the center but will continue to learn as they work with their children back in their classrooms. Teachers feel they are really getting something when they take home something they have made, especially when it is free or there has been only a minimal charge for the workshop. Materials are especially important when working with young children who need concrete experiences before they are able to think abstractly. Working with materials is helpful to people at any age, but is essential for encouraging the learning of elementary school children. The effort that goes into making the materials is carried over into the classroom; a teacher is apt to see many more ways children can learn from materials she/he has made.

Over half the centers (25 centers) have space available for teachers to display the materials they have made and used in their classrooms. Exchange is encouraged. Teachers get new ideas from each other. Teachers want to use materials they know have been tried in the classroom with success. Teachers get additional encouragement from other teachers commenting on their work.

Over half the centers (27 centers) have commercial materials available for teachers to inspect. In some cases, teachers may borrow them to use in their classrooms. The display of commercial materials keeps teachers apprised of new products as they come out. Teachers are increasingly being given freedom to order materials of their own choosing for their classroom; the displays provide the needed exposure to enable the teachers to make the best decisions.

Teachers are becoming more aware of the learning potential in discarded objects. Twenty four centers now offer a scrounge or recycling service where teachers can find discards to use in their rooms. Teachers can use scrounge materials to make other materials or to supply construction projects of the children they teach. The scrounge center saves the teachers much time and effort in gathering materials while awaking them to the possibilities in materials they come across. Once aware of the manifold opportunities present in scrounge materials, teachers encourage their students to bring in things from home and parents to donate supplies from work.

Size of the Centers

12. The approximate square footage of the center is _____.

Question 12 pertaining to the square footage available in the center was not answered by half of the centers.

Those who did not answer the question either did not know the square footage or, perhaps, could not accurately estimate it. The answers given to Question 12 are found in Table 13.

Table 13

SIZE OF THE CENTER

Square Footage	Number of Centers
under 500 sq. ft.	2
500-1,000 sq. ft.	2
1,500-4,000 sq. ft.	10
4,000-6,500 sq. ft.	8
10,000-11,000 sq. ft.	2
2 large manor houses	1
	25

No answer: 17 centers

The environmental layouts of the centers vary according to the space available. If space is limited, the centers put a variety of activities into a large, central room. This room is often set up and operated much like an open classroom with people being able to explore different areas at the same time. If a center has several rooms available, one room may be set up for language activities, one for math,one for science, one for weaving, etc. (The Mountain View Teacher Center, The Multiple Alternatives Program). In these centers, specialists are hired to give technical instruction in the specific areas.

Most centers which answered the question have space equal to the size of a small house to two very large houses. But teachers centers are found operating in both large and small amounts of space.

Summary of Physical Facilities

What is especially remarkable about the physical facilities of centers is the variety available and the flexibility and diversity in programming they permit. Centers are places for teachers to come and do rather than to come and listen. Space is provided for informal exchange and for exploring the many opportunities for learning when working with materials. No two centers seem identical in the ways they utilize their space or in the different activities offered. Many centers use their space flexibly and make changes from time to time.

The facilities of the centers and the activities scheduled which make use of these facilities are the main ways centers are able to attract teachers on a non-paying, non-credit basis after school hours. The interest in craft and socialization among teachers parallels the interest in craft and group interaction in the community at large. The physical setting of the center encourages active participation of teachers in the workshops scheduled; the center staff encourages the active participation of teachers in center functioning.

Educational Programs

Question 13.[8] Workshops.
Please indicate the workshops your center has offered. Use a separate sheet for any additions.

Topic	Single Session	Multiple Sessions	Intensive or Summer Session
General Workshops			
Aesthetics			
Child Development			
Classroom Management			
Communication			
Games			
Math			
Science			

In centers, the workship has become the vehicle for professional growth and, even within university circles, is replacing the regular course in many instances. Especially in universities on the forefront of developing new educational strategies and programs, has the workshop, with its modular course credit, become increasingly popular.

While, formerly, the child sat and absorbed the widsom of the teacher and the teacher that of the professor, the workshop is a way in which people become instrumental in their own learning. "I hear and I forget; I see and I remember; I do and I understand" has become the hallmark of the center movement as well as that of open education.

---

8. See Appendix A for the question on workshops in the unabbreviated form.

The return to work done with the hands as well as the mind has brought with it the opportunity for people to feel successful about what they have created; the pleasures derived from tangible work are once again given the dignity they had before school became reading, writing and arithmetic without craft.

Furthermore, the work done by Piaget and the reception his work has had by many psychologists as well as by teachers has given further support to the belief that children, before they reach the age of formal operations, generally somewhere after eleven years,need concrete materials in order to learn. Without working with concrete materials, children may appear to be learning because they are able to use terminology correctly, but often will not have reached a true understanding of the concepts involved. The workshop has become an instrument for allowing teachers to develop many new learning experiences in their classrooms through the use of concrete materials.

The data gathered in response to Question 13 as well as from reading the announcements of center activities appearing in bulletins and newsletters shows that there are two basic workshop approaches.

One type is a general workhop. Here the environment is set up affording people the opportunity to choose from a wide range of possible learning activities. This type of workshop has been most frequently offered as a summer program in which teachers have three to four weeks in which to explore many facets of the environment and

their own learning. For this type of workshop, learning centers are located throughout the center complex, or, if the center is smaller, in different parts of the room. Materials are supplied; possibilities for their use are sometimes suggested, most often after teachers have explored all of the possibilities they can find themselves. Creativity and flexibility are greatly encouraged. The workshop staff gives its support and guidance and joins in the learning as well as in the teaching process. It is hoped that this teaching-learning style will carry over with the teachers as they return to their classrooms.

The second type of workshop is the skill oriented workshop. In this case, a specific medium or theme is pre-established and activities are suggested and presented around that topic. Here teachers are able to further their expertise within a particular area within a short period of time. The exact outcome, the exact learnings of the workshop are not predetermined, but a framework is established at the beginning. A more controlled situation occurs in this type of workshop than in a general workshop. The emphasis is on specific skills which can be translated directly into classroom activities. "Learn tonight; bring into the classroom tomorrow" is the idea. Thus teachers leave the workshops with ways in which they can immediately enrich their own classroom

Both types of workshops are appropriate in furthering teachers' professional development. Teachers choose

one when they want to explore more on their own and the other when they want more direction or specific skills in a given area.

Table 14 presents a collation of the data on the types of workshops centers offer.

Table 14

WORKSHOPS OFFERED

Type of Workshop	Single Session	Multiple Session	Intensive or Summer Session
General	12	11	10
The Arts			
Clay	11	6	1
Construction	17	11	1
Drama	3	6	0
Movement	15	12	1
Music	15	11	0
Painting	10	9	1
Photography	16	12	3
Printing	10	10	0
Scrounge Materials	17	11	2
Tri-Wall	17	11	1
Weaving	8	8	1
Child Development	13	10	3
Classroom Management(general)	6	10	6
Activity Cards	11	11	4
Environmental Design	15	10	2
Group Dynamics	11	8	3
Integration of Curriculum	13	11	5
Record Keeping & Evaluation	13	11	4
Games	16	13	3
Language Arts			
Creative Writing	12	11	1
Haiku	5	1	0
Puppetry	10	7	0
Math	14	15	3
Science	14	16	5

See Appendix D for a full list of workshops listed in center newsletters and publications.

While Table 14, Workshops Offered gives some idea of the variety of workshops available, it is not highly accurate.

Some centers consider that if working with clay is available within the framework of a general workshop, then a workshop is given in clay. Other centers say that a workshop in clay is given only if there is a workshop specifically geared to that medium. Difficulty in categorizing also occurs because of the inter-disciplinary nature of many of the workshops. Appendix D lists the titles of workshops found in the literature centers sent; here can be seen the full spectrum of offerings as well as the originality and creativity that goes into selecting the titles.

Most workshops fall into one of two categories- arts and crafts and methods for individualizing the curriculum. This contrasts to traditional in-service courses concerned with skill development in isolation rather than in connection with areas that are of interest to children. Perhaps arts and crafts courses are in so much demand becaue most pre-service education programs neglect this aspect of a teacher's work. They offer art courses only to the potential art specialist. The popularity of courses in arts and crafts may also occur because a tenet of information education is that basic skills can be acquired while working with concrete materials.

Summary of Workshops

The center is the basic medium of teacher center activities. There are two basic types being given. One is a general workshop to acquaint teachers with methods of

individualizing the curriculum, with open classroom organization and curriculum development, and with learning how to learn. The second type emphasizes a specific skill or content area. This type is more structures and is designed to give the teacher concrete activities and skills which can be immediately translated into classroom activities.

The workshop format encourages active participation of teachers and their involvement in their own learning. The titles of the workshops are often very enticing (The Advisory and Learning Exchange, The Center in Greenwich, The Center for Open Education in Storrs, and the Greater Boston Teacher Center are centers which choose their titles with ingenuity.)

It is the informality of the workshop with its focus on working with materials that attracts teachers. They feel they have control over their own learning and can be involved in those activities which will be most helpful to them personally and professionally.

The Organization of Workshops

14. Does the staff give workshops in schools?
15. Must reachers register for workshops?

Most centers hold at least some of their workshops within schools. This is important, as it keeps center staff in physical contact with schools as well as being convenient to teachers.

Table 15 shows the responses to Question 14.

Table 15

WORKSHOPS HELD IN SCHOOLS

Frequency of Workshops in Schools	No. of Centers	% of Total
Regularly Held in Schools	34	81
Never Held in Schools	6	15
Occasionally Held in Schools	1	2
No answer:	1	2
	42	100%

In order to accomodate as many teachers as possible, registration for courses is not always required although usually preferred. When asked if teachers must pre-register for workshops, roughly one third said this is not necessary. About one fourth said that pre-registration is not necessary but that teachers could then attend on a space availability basis. Table 16 shows the centers' responses to Question 15.

Table 16

PRE-REGISTRATION FOR WORKSHOPS

Requirement	No. of Centers	% of Total
Pre-registration is Necessary	18	43
Pre-registration is not necessary	13	31
Pre-registration is not necessary, participation is allowed if space permits	11	26
	42	100%

Summary of Organizational Policies

Generally centers try to be as flexible as possible in order to encourage participation. While pre-registration for workshops is required by almost half of the centers, some centers will permit last minute participation on a space availability basis.

Workshops are often held in schools in order to make them more convenient to the teachers. Sometimes they are held in the classrooms of the teachers who conduct the sessions. This gives teachers an opportunity to see many teacher-made materials in the classroom. It also enables the teachers leading the workshops to have at hand any supplies they need. Workshops which require special materials or equipment are, of necessity, held at the centers themselves.

Informal Activities at the Centers

16. Can teachers drop in?
17. What hours is the center open?

As has already been stated, much of the learning that takes place at the centers happens informally. There is exchange among the participants during actual workshop sessions, but very often valuable discussion is held by people who drop by the center to explore the materials either alone or with resource personnel. Most centers encourage dropping by; see Table 17.

Table 17

DROP-IN POLICIES

Policy	No. of Centers	% of Total
Dropping By is Encouraged	37	88
Dropping by is not permitted	4	10
No answer	1	2
	42	100%

Whether or not teachers visit informally is dependent upon the hours the centers are open. The hours any particular center is open varies according to the hours of the public school, the availability of staff, and the extent to which teachers can come to the center during the day on a released time basis.

The greatest number of centers, 35 (83% of the total) are open all day during the school week and weekdays until 5:00 P.M.or 6:00 P.M.; this allows ample time for teachers to use the centers after school. Five centers are open only during the school day; these centers must, therefore, operate within school systems which permit teachers to use the centers on a released time basis. The fact that most centers are open after school is indicative that most teachers use the centers in their free time. Table 18 gives the hours the centers are open.

Table 18

HOURS THE CENTERS ARE OPEN

HOURS	No. of Centers	% of Total
All Day Weekdays Until 5:00 or 6:00	35	83
Some Weekdays	5	12
Released Time During School Only	5	12
Saturday, Full Day	3	7
Saturday, Half Day	9	21
Sunday, Full Day	1	2
Sunday, Half Day	2	5
According to the Workshop Schedule	5	12
By appointment Sat. & Sunday	2	5
One Saturday/Month	1	2
Evenings Per Week		
1 Evening	6	15
2 Evenings	4	9
3 Evenings	2	5
4 Evenings	3	7
5 Evenings	2	5
Total of Centers Open At Least One Evening	17	38

In addition to 83% of the centers being open after school hours but before dinner, 41% of the centers are open at least one evening. The long hours the centers are open means that either the staff works a long day or else that the staff rotates to cover the centers in the evening and weekend hours. The fact that teachers are willing to come to the centers after school and on the weekend indicates that they are willing to put in the extra time if they think the activities are worthwhile.

Advisory Service

18. Does your center offer an advisory service?

The advisory service is a special contribution of the center movement to in-service programs. Center staff talking with individual teachers about their individual problems, often visiting the teacher's classroom on a repeated basis, function as advisors. They are consultants, guides and supportive personnel positions far more helpful than the normal supervisory. An advisory team does not check-up on teachers; the teachers can suffer no dire consequences as a result of a visit from the advisory team. Teachers feel that an advisory team has expertise to give when needed yet is supportive of the teachers' own growth and changes within the classroom.

Most centers do offer an advisory service (37 centers or 88% of the total). See table 19.

Table 19

AVAILABILITY OF AN ADVISORY SERVICE

Availability	No. of Centers	% of Total
Centers With an Advisory	37	88
Centers Without an Advisory	3	7
Centers with a Limited Advisory	1	2+
No answer	1	2+
	42	100%

Of course the advisory service of any given center is limited to the time of the center staff. Centers must

set certain priorities. Some centers want a commitment from the principal of a school that he or she wants to move in the direction of open education before the team will go in to aid teachers. Other centers give priority to teachers working in schools funded through certain programs, e.g., District Six Advisory Center is funded with Follow Through funds and gives priority to teachers working in Follow Through schools.

Summary of the Advisory Service

The services of center staff acting as an advisory team is one of the most important ways teachers centers function as change agents. As an advisory team, center staff works closely with teachers in their classrooms giving them support as well as guidance in helping their programs along. Since the advisory functions in a non-supervisory capacity and works only with the expressed desires of the teachers, it is able to help the teachers effect the changes they would like to make. Because the center is a year round operation, year after year, the advisory is able to give continuing support and service to teachers as they grow.

Summary of the Educational Component

The educational component is the reason for teachers' centers existence. Within the sphere of in-service education centers offer a variety of services which give mutual support

to each other. Workshops, general and specific, informal discussions with other teachers and staff, accessibility in time and place, resourcefulness in materials and personnel--make the centers a singularly effective change agent helping teachers to change what they would like to change. Centers assist teachers and other persons, concerned with the education of children as well as themselves, with the process of their on-going learning.

Communication of Center Activities

19. How does your center communicate the activities scheduled and the services available?

Communication of center activities and services is the lifeblood of the centers' work. Without being able to spread information about the activities it offers, no one would come to use the centers, as seldom is compulsion involved.

Most centers use multiple means of publicity. Word of mouth and a mailing list are the two most frequently used. School and administrative offices post mailings from the centers so that an increasing number of people are exposed to the activities currently being held.

The most common forms of publicity are reported in Table 20.

Table 20

METHODS OF COMMUNICATING CENTER ACTIVITIES

Methods	No. of Centers	% of Total
Word of Mouth	35	83
Mailing List	28	66
Flyers	26	61
Newspaper Ad	12	29
TV or Radio	12	29
Newsletter	9	22

In addition to those methods listed in Table 22, centers also communicate through school newspapers, teacher center bulletins, N.E.A. representatives and mailings, representatives from the union, college catalogues, board's of education in-service course list, teachers' union regional newspaper and newsletter, district personnel and supervisors in special curriculum areas, university facilities, and conference presentations.

Summary of Methods of Communication

Most centers use multiple ways to communicate their activities and services, the most common being a mailing list and word of mouth by people who use the centers.

Affiliations with Other Organizations

20. Is the center affiliated with another organization?

Most teachers centers do not work alone and are affiliated with another organization in some ways. In part this may be due to the dependency of the centers financially, but it may also be because centers need to associate with other educational institutions in order to be effective. This is especially true of affiliation with schools and school systems.

Those centers not tied to other institutions because of funding still seek working relationships with them. Sometimes school systems make contractual arrangements with centers to get specific services for which the centers are reimbursed. The Teacher Center in New Haven, The M.A.P. Program at the University of Bridgeport, The District Six Advisory Center in Philadelphia are centers which make such arrangements.

Table 21 shows the affiliations reported by the centers.

Table 21

AFFILIATIONS WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Types of Affiliation	No. of Centers	% of Total
Single Affiliation		
School System(s)	13	31
University(s)	6	14
School(s)	2	5
Community Organization	2	5
	23	55%
Multiple Affiliations		
University & School System(s)	6	14
University & School	1	2
	7	16
Total Affiliated Centers	30	71
No Affiliation	10	24
No Answer	2	5
	42	100%

Change theorists have said effective change agents are involved with interlocking institutions. Over 70% of the centers are affiliated with another educational institution in some way. In this manner, they are able to keep in contact not only with teachers, paraprofessionals and parents but also with the well established educational institutions.

Affiliation with universities and/or school systems makes graduate and in-service credit for teachers who participate in center activities more likely.

In-Service and Graduate Credit

21. Do teachers get in-service and/or graduate credit for attending workshops held in the centers?

The question of whether or not it is desirable that credit be given for participating in workshops is debated. Some centers feel that active participation will diminish if credit is given. There is fear that teachers will come to the centers only to get credit, not to become involved.

Other center personnel feel that since teachers are furthering their own professional growth by coming to workshops, they ought to be able to get credit for having done so just as they have received credit for attending university and traditional in-service programs.

The reality is that most centers are not in a position to grant either in-service or graduate credit. This can be obtained only by the individual negotiating with the university or the school system. On the other hand, some centers arrange for people who attend workshops to be given credit at specific universities. This is especially true of summer sessions. In centers connected with universities, of course, credit for workshop participation is part of the program. Other teachers, not enrolled in the university, may come to the workshops free of charge if they do not wish graduate credit. In any case, workshops are basically an inexpensive route to in-service education which is non-credit bearing. If the teacher wishes graduate credit,

in most cases, they have to pay the regular tuition fee to the university in addition to the workshop fee.

While some centers may resist becoming involved in red tape, the granting of credit for work done at the centers is one way in which their value is recognized and teachers' centers become more legitimate institutions.

Table 22 reports the centers' responses to in-service and graduate credit. It should be kept in mind that, in most cases, credit is arranged by the student rather than by the center.

Table 22

CREDIT AVAILABLE FOR WORKSHOP PARTICIPATION

Graduate Credit

Availability	No. of Centers	% of Total
Available	28	66
Not Available	7	17
Total	35	83%
No Answer	7	17
	42	100%

In-Service Credit

Availability		
Available	23	55
Not Available	12	28
Available Soon	2	5
Total	37	88%
Not Applicable	2	5
No Answer	3	7
	42	100%

In-service credit is available for workshop participation in 25 centers (60% of the total). This shows that professional growth through workshops is becoming at least partially accepted by school boards. If school boards recognize that center programs are worthwhile, pressure to contribute to financing center activities may result in increased support.

Since graduate credit is also being granted in 67% of the centers, universities, too, are acknowledging the value of center activities. As universities themselves have begun to offer workshops as part of established educational programs, workshops at centers attain added respectability. Examples of universities offering workshops for course credit are The University of Massachusetts, The University of Bridgeport, University of Connecticut, City College, Queens College, S.U.N.Y., Harvard University, Fairfield University, and Antioch College.

Summary of Teacher Center Affiliations

Most teachers centers are affiliated with some other educational organization, i.e., either with schools, school systems, or universities. This affiliation helps bring the centers into avenues already established for in-service teacher training, with educational policy makers, and with teachers who use the services of the centers. Affiliation also facilitates helping teachers obtain graduade and in-service credit for their participation in center activities.

The implications of center affiliation bear on whether or not centers can function with teachers involved in the decision-making processes while maintaining their affiliations with more established educational organizations. More research is needed in this area.

Decision-Making

22. Who makes the major policy decisions which determine the activities of the centers?
__School Board __Funding Body __Teachers
__Administrative Staff __Community Board
__Others (please specify)

Question 22 seeks to find out if teachers' centers are really a new alternative to in-service education or merely a new form of an old tradition. This question was asked in order to ascertain how responsive the centers are to the real needs of teachers. Are American centers controlled by teachers as British centers are?[9] Are the centers' organizations which are operating for the benefit of teachers without soliciting any input from them? What attempts are being made to find out what teachers want from the centers? Is there any input from the teachers on a day to day basis? To what extent are school administrators and university professors determing the activities of the centers?

A wide variation in the decision-making is reported by the centers. Sixteen (39% of the centers) listed a

---

9. Woodruff and Konicek, op. cit., pp. 4-6.

single body as the decision-making group although in several instances this body is composed of people representing a variety of interests.

Twenty-two centers (52% of the total) indicate that they have joint decision-making procedures which take into account different interest groups affected by the centers.

Analysis of the data, reported in Table 23, shows that the majority of teachers centers utilize joint decision-making processes. The administrative staff in conjuncion with another group or center board composed of teachers, community representatives, etc. make decisions in most of the centers.

Table 23 reports the answers to the question about decision-making practices.

Table 23

DECISION-MAKING PRACTICES

Decisions Made by a Single Group

Name of Group	No. of Centers	% of Total
Administrative Staff	12	29
Teachers	2	5
School Board	1	2+
University Faculty	1	2+
	16	39%

Decisions Made by a Variety of Interest Groups

Name of Groups		
Center Board	8	19
Center Staff & Teachers	4	9
Center Staff & Community Board	1	2+
Center Staff & Center Board	1	2+
Center Staff, Community Board & Teachers	1	2+
Center Staff, Community Board, Funding Body & Teachers	1	2+
Center Staff, Community Board, Center Board	1	2+
Center Staff, Teachers, Univ. Professors, Univ. Students	1	2+
Center Staff & Funding Body	1	2+
Funding Body, Parents & Teachers	1	2+
Center Staff, Community Board, Teachers, Univ. Fac. & Students	1	2+
Center Staff, Teachers & Consultants	1	2+
	22	52%
No Answer	4	9
	42	100%

Centers report that there is direct input from teachers in making decisions in nineteen centers. Center staffs in their roles as advisory teams receive continual feedback from teachers about the types of activities they would like the centers to offer. Centers also receive input from teachers by mailing questionaires with the

announcements of workshops and from suggestion boxes located in the centers. But the greatest control teachers have over keeping the centers responsive to their needs is not coming to those offerings they feel have no relevance. Because participation is voluntary and demands that the teachers give up their free time to attend workshops or drop by, centers remain continually in touch with teacher needs.

The influence of funding sources may be larger than the data suggests. Funding bodies are listed as being involved in the decision-making processes in only three cases, yet they have established, in their granting of funds, the basic framework within which the center operates. This established, the funding bodies may feel they do not need to be involved in the day to day decisions of center activities. The purpose of funding many teachers centers has been to establish an institution in which teachers make the major decisions.

One center, The Teacher Center in New Haven, holds a regularly scheduled bi-monthly meeting at which center policies are determined. Within budget restraints and guidlines established by the funding organizations, the center's major decisions are made at these open meetings. These meetings parallel the class meeting held in most open classrooms and the town meeting so common in early American history.[10]

---

10. Mailing from The Teacher Center, New Haven, Conn., "Board Meetings--open to all!--every other Wednesday night at 7:30 P.M. starting Nov. 15, 1972.

As can be seen from the variety of combinations of parties involved in centers making decisions jointly, no single pattern emerged. Each center seems to have evolved an individual combination of parties, included in making their decisions. Even university faculties, with one exception, share the policy-making responsibility with others.

What is most significant and was, indeed, unexpected, is that no center lists school administrators as making the decisions about what should go on in the center either as a single body of in conjunction with others. In only one case is the school board listed as making major policy decisions.

This is in direct contrast to the traditional pattern of in-service education within the public school sector where either curriculum specialists or staff development personnel representing the administration decided the content as well as the method of the in-service programs. The decision-making procedures in the centers stand in contrast to often typical patterns of in-service education wherein those who know best, i.e., those in the administration, decide what is best for those who know less, i.e., the teachers. The response of those who would be most affected is most often not even considered when establishing in-service courses.[11] This lack of participation of

---

11. Pilcher, op. cit., p. 2.

administrative personnel in the decision-making processes of the centers is a major finding in this study.

Summary About Decision Making Practices

The majority of centers desire input from a variety of sectors served by the centers and thus include representatives from these sectors in the decision-making procedures.

While teachers are listed as being included formally in the decision-making processes in half of the centers, their input is sought through informal means as well. Teachers exercise great control over the decisions made at the center by not participating in the activities they do not feel are worthwhile.

One of the most striking findings of this study is the absence of administrative personnel in the decision-making processes of the centers. While the centers do differ from traditional in-service programs in several ways, one of the most significant is the absence of administrative personnel in determining what activities will be offered.

Community Involvement

23. How are people from the community actively involved in the center?

The move toward decentralization of some large urban school districts and the trend toward greater community involvement began at the same time many teachers' centers

started to be established. In the informality of the centers, an increasing number of paraprofessionals are trained. The increased use of parent volunteers and the growing feeling that learning goes on in the whole community as well as in school all make the centers' involvement in the community at large and the community's involvement in the center possible. In fact, this is coming slowly. Centers seem to be concentrating their efforts on teachers' and paraprofessionals' use of the center before going out to involve the community.

There are instances, however, in which centers were founded as places for community involvement (The Store Front Learning Center in Boston, The Studio Museum in Harlem, Community Resources, Inc. in Manhattan, The Children's Museum in Boston and the Basement Workshop in Manhattan).

The answers to the question about community involvement are reported in Table 24.

Table 24

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Type of Involvement	No. of Centers	% of Centers
Community Participates in Center Activities	21	50
Community is a Governance Body	7	17
Community Benefits from the Center	6	14
Community Provides Materials & Resource Personnel	13	31
Volunteers from the Community Staff the Center	4	10
Center Facilities are used for Other Community Activities	1	2
Community is Involved Only Slightly	2	5
No Direct Involvement	3	7
No Answer	7	17

Some centers list multiple ways the community is involved while others do not list any involvement. A few centers indicate that teachers centers are for teachers and school personnel rather than for the community at large. Others state that the community benefits from the existence of the center since it is to help better education of the children of the community.

Of all of the questions in the survey, this question was answered by the fewest respondents. The answers given do not clearly indicate the extent to which the community is involved, especially in the education of parents, parent volunteers and paraprofessionals. The area of community involvement in center activities needs greater research.

Summary of Community Involvement

Through their literature, centers stress that they provide a neutral meeting ground for all people interested in the educational process--teachers, volunteers, para-professionals, administrators, parents. As people who use the center live in the community, the community is involved in the activities offered. The community provides resources both material and personal to aid in the functioning of the center. The center as an active force in bringing about educational changes through political orientation is one not mentioned in the materials sent by the centers.

C H A P T E R I V

TEACHER CENTER PROFILES

Collection of the Data

Most of the information contained in this chapter was obtained from materials sent by the centers with their responses to the questionaire and from working with the centers' staffs over a period of time. Continuing contact has been maintained with The Center in Greenwich, The Multiple Alternatives Program at the University of Bridgeport, and the Durham Parent Teacher Center in Philadelphia.

Overview

In the original proposal for this study, it was thought that this chapter would contain profiles of three basic types of centers: those funded from a single source, those funded through multiple sources, and those affiliated with a university. It was thought that a relationship could be found between the parties involved in the decision-making process and the type of funds that the center received. But no such relationship has been found. Regardless of the type of categorization proposed, there are always centers which do not fall within the limitations of the proposed groupings.

Since 1970, in addition to the three programs men-

tioned above, I have personally visited fourteen other centers. These include: the Mountain View Teacher Center, and The Environmental Studies Project in Boulder; The Advisory for Open Education, The Workshop for Learning Things, Educational Development Corporation, The Children's Museum and The Fayerweather Street School, all in the greater Boston area; The Wave Hill Center for Environmental Education, the Creative Teaching Workship, Museums Collaborative, Inc., and the Urban Resources Center, all in New York; The District Six Advisory Center and The Brooks School Workshop for Day Care Services in Philadelphia; and the Leicester Teachers' Center in Leicester, England. Visiting the centers has given an added understanding of their history and functioning.

Profiles of five centers are presented to show the diversities and similarities among teachers centers. In some profiles, the development of the center has been emphasized, in others, their educational programs. In each case, the profile focuses on that aspect of the center which is of particular interest. Centers were selected on the basis of the author's personal acquaintance with them, the amount of materials that they sent telling about their activities, or the individuality of their programs. Profiles on the following centers are included: The Durham Parent Teacher Center, The Center in Greenwich, The Multiple Alternatives Program at the University of Bridgeport,

The Training Complex at Appalachian State University, and the Teachers' Interactive Learning Center in Hartford.

Following the profiles are notes on a variety of other centers highlighting a few aspects of each center.

The Profiles

The Durham Parent - Teachers Center

The learning center idea was actualized as early as 1963-1964 in several inner city Philadelphia elementary schools. Centers were designed to give children informal, activity-centered learning experiences at least part of the day. Classroom teachers went with their children to these laboratories and consequently began gradually to change their own classrooms to more informal methods of learning. The project was started through local funding although soon Title I money was added to enable the staff of three professionals to expand its activities.[1]

Within four years, requests for help had increased so much that a center was established with a resident staff, expanded facilities, and extended laboratory hours. "Dramatic changes in teacher morale, teacher interaction,

---

1. Lore Rasmussen, "The Philadelphia Teacher Center: Its Evaluation and Role in a Many Faceted Educational Partnership", speech delivered at the Syracuse University Policy Commission Conference on Teachers' Centers, Spring, 1972, p.1.

teaching styles, and classroom appearance occurred as the year progressed. Not everyone was affected in the same way or to the same extent, but in no way was there any external pressure to change."[2]

By 1968, the teacher center had become closely linked to the alternative program in the school in which it was housed. Thus teachers who came to the workshops to make materials at the center were able to see examples of other teachers who had also made things and were using them in real classroom situations within the school.

The center received an additional boost when space within the building made it possible for the district superintendent, Dr. Mathew Costanzo, to move into the building where the center was located. In January, 1972, Dr. Costanzo became Philadelphia's Superintendent of Schools.[3] Dr. Costanzo personally witnessed how the teacher center was instrumental in changing the old, dreary building into an exciting place for learning. Moving into the Durham School was a matter of unused space, but once in contact with the activities of the center, Dr. Costanzo became a supporter of its work. Other teachers centers are being started at several other

---

2. Ibid., p. 2
3. Rasmussen, op. cit., p. 2

schools throughout the city.

In ennumerating the forces for and against educational change, Jwaideb and Markus state,

"Many experts on educational change have said that the superintendent is the key person in the adoption or rejection of educational innovations."[4]

Dr. Costanzo has been a positive force in helping teachers centers in Philadelphia to become integral components in the city's in-service education program.

By 1973, the Durham Teacher Center was functioning as a resource center for parents and teachers outside Durham School as well as being a vital force to the projects currently located within the school: a continuing education program for school-aged mothers, an infant day care center which includes a nursery as well as a toddler program where most of the babies of the school-aged mothers are cared for, a preschool program, and a regular elementary school with an alternative program. The Teacher Center has evolved into a Parent-Teacher Center where teachers construct materials for their classrooms and parents make toyes, games, puzzles, furniture, and teaching materials for their homes.[5] "The cohesiveness of the Durham Child

---

4. Jwaideb and Markus, op. cit., p. 10.
5. Durham Teacher Center, "The Durham Child Development Center", Philadelphia, Pa.: School District of Philadelphia, Feb., 1972, p. 1.

Development Center derives, in part, from the enormous amount of interchange among adults and child in all programs."[6]

The program is a constructive example of community involvement within the public school system. "Some are tempted to label the school 'experimental'. It is not. It is merely an attempt, growing organically out of many years of experience within the Philadelphia School System, to establish a new kind of community public school--one that offers a range of educational services rarely seen in a public school building."[7]

Though the building was constructed in 1909, bright colors and good elements of design are seen throughout. My visits to the center between May and November, 1973, have found an environment which continues to change and be refreshed. The center and the programs within the building offer continuing excitement. The work in the hallways, the close contact among adults and children in many programs within the school, and the informal approach of the integrated day format of the elementary school and the teacher center draw people from far beyond the neighborhood to join the educational happenings there.

---

6. Ibid., p. 7.
7. Durham Teacher Center, op. cit., p. 10.

Yet the center is designed not as a showpiece, but to serve the community in the area. Because of the infant day care program, the building is open every day until 5:30 P.M. while the Teacher Center is open two evenings and Saturday mornings.[8]

The Durham Parent-Teacher Center has attracted many people; its success is also attested to by their continuing to receive E.D.C. funds to publish curriculum materials the teachers have developed while working there.[9] Arlene Silverman wrote an article which presents the flavor of the center,

"Although Philadelphia teachers have a contract . . . they throng to the Teacher Center without receiving any additional pay--or even carfare. They come because the Teacher Center is a treasure house of new methods and materials that enable them to convert 'pencil and paper' style classrooms, which haven't changed significantly in a hundred years, into richly equipped learning laboratories where each individual child becomes an active explorer, with the teacher as his guide. There is hardly a concept, regardless of subject matter, that Don Rasmussen and his staff cannot help a teacher communicate more effectively by way of specially devising puzzles, games, and other materials."[10]

Don Rasmussen gives the rationale for working the way the Durham Center does,

---

8. Rasmussen, op. cit., p. 6.
9. Arlene Silverman, "A Santa's Workshop for Teachers" in American Education, U.S. Dept. H.E.W., Office of Education, Dec., 1971, p. 3.
10. Ibid., p. 2.

"Our methods of working with teachers are of necessity individualized because each one comes for a very specific purpose and from a different setting. We are, therefore, a kind of open classroom for adults--a demonstration of one of the alternatives teachers consider for themselves. Whenever we are asked, we point out that we are organized as an open classroom out of necessity because no teacher would return (They would drop out.) if we lined them up, kept them quiet, and dominated their activities . . . Our workshop began with a very simple objective--to help teachers get and make things they wanted or felt they needed to work more effectively with their children. We entered their classroom with their consent to effect the changes they desired."[11]

In Philadelphia, the Parent-Teacher Center at Durham Elementary School is but one of several centers located throughout the city. While receiving federal funding and support from E.D.C. to publish curriculum materials developed there, it has both fiscal and verbal support from the School District of Philadelphia. A community involved center for people of all ages closely affiliated with a single school, Durham is open to teachers throughout the city and beyond to visit the center on released time during the school day and after school as well. Teachers may use their three visiting days to attend workshops at the center. The Center also serves as a field experience for students in the Antioch work-study program.

In a comment about the effectiveness of the center,

---

11. Don Rasmussen, "The Philadelphia Teacher Center: A View from the Shop", speech delivered at Syracuse University, Policy Commission Conference on Teachers' Centers, Spring, 1972.

Don Rasmussen states,

"We have seen the growth of our center over the years, but how about its influence? We have now worked with and observed more than 10,000 teachers as they have left the workshop with their shoe box labs, puppet theaters, chairs, tables and a hundred thousand things. Can we speak of the effect of all this on the lives of children in schools and classrooms? Did everything that was made even reach the children? For example, did the cubicle a teacher made become the isolation cell within a classroom prison or did it provide the privacy all children need from active, busy people around them? Did the balance a teacher made for her kindergarten come to stand...or did it become a tool for children to discover relationships in the world around them? Did the teacher in the workshop who cried, 'I can't use that saw; I never saw it before' and yet tried, recognize that children were echoing her every day with the same cry about math and spelling? We don't know the answers to these questions unless we are able to visit the classrooms of teachers who have been at the Center."

"Occasionally, all too infrequently, we have that opportunity, and when we do, we are invariably impressed with the importance to a teacher of the least thing he or she has created at the workshop."[12]

Rasmussen's evaluation of the effectiveness of Durham's work is that of one deeply involved with the work of a center. He feels that the administrative support given to teachers who have worked at the center is adequate evidence to support its continued and expanded activities.

While I am not personally involved in center activities in Philadelphia, as I go around the city and poke

---

12. Don Rasmussen, op. cit., p. 6.

my head into a variety of classrooms, I see evidence that teachers have used the center extensively. Their rooms are filled with teacher-made and scrounged materials. Children's work is displayed attractively and is constantly changing. While the schools I have visited have all been funded by Follow Through funds, here the teachers are providing stimulating environments as a result of their involvement with the centers in the city.[13]

As time has gone on, a variety of programs are turning to the centers for in-service training--Day Care Services, Head Start, in-service sessions for principals, health advocates, para-professionals, nurses.

As teachers centers become involved in an ever expanding variety of programs in a city, their existence becomes more assured and their sources of revenue more diversified. In Philadelphia, the teachers centers have become institutionalized into the educational organizational structure.

---

13. I visit Follow Through classrooms as I am the Resident Evaluator of the city's 22 Head Start centers.

The Multiple Alternatives Program
University of Bridgeport, Conn.

The Multiple Alternatives Program (M.A.P.), at the University of Bridgeport started out as an alternative program for Master Degree candidates in elementary education. During 1971-72, students were to take up to 9 credits as part of M.A.P. This program was geared to meeting the needs of the individuals enrolled by custom tailoring a program for them. While attendance at the workshop-style class sessions was encouraged, students were able to become involved in experiences of their choosing in order to gain the competencies which were the goals they had set for themselves.

With the high morale and enthusiasm of four faculty members and students, the University supported the expansion of the program. Headquarters were moved from a large room with staff offices in the basement of a dormitory to a three story house on campus. With the move, the program began to evolve into a teachers center as well as a university program.

During 1972-73 students could take even more credits through M.A.P. and plans were formulated to be able to get the entire degree within the program. The faculty met with their undergraduate classes in the center; in-service and pre-service teachers were brought together. In spite

of any university policies about who could come and not come to the centers, the staff always encouraged teachers in the program to bring along their colleagues to workshop sessions.

This second year, participants were recruited from schools; administrators were incorporated into the program so that a support system could be established. Having several teachers from a single school within the program encouraged this support system; the faculty went into the schools several days a week as an Advisory. Needs were assessed and articulated on all levels; the program was made relevant to existing situations.

Courses were held in the workshop format. Resource people outside the university were brought in as consultants to add scope and skill to the university staff. Particularly, practicing teachers were paid as workshop leaders.

I first became involved in the program the year before when a faculty member asked to video-tape my room and for me to lead a workshop on management techniques in the open classroom and then, later, on making math materials. The recognition of the staff of the work teachers were doing in the field as well as the strengths of those enrolled in the program encouraged participants to use great energy in trying to grow and effect changes. As time went on, more and more non-matriculated students began coming to workshops. Parents were encouraged to come to add yet another

component. They were very helpful in working with teachers about teacher-parent relationships.

Thus the program which began as a formal university endeavor in individualized graduate education, has evolved into a resource center for people not formally connected with the university. Plans were being formulated in 1973 to establish an additional resource center in one of the schools being served.

Pressures of staff time and university policy prevent M.A.P. from being as informal as many teachers centers are. It is the attitude of the faculty to be responsive to the various parties involved in the educational process that makes M.A.P. a functioning teachers center. They have created a program in which all people grow together in a supportive, non-threatening atmosphere.

The Center in Greenwich Connecticut

The Center in Greenwich, located on the campus of the Convent of the Sacred Heart, was started in September, 1972 with funding from the New World Foundation and the encouragement of the Convent. Workshops on informal education have been held during the summers of 1970-1973 under the auspices of the National Association of Independent Schools. Celia Houghton and Jenny Andreae who have been responsible for organizing and administrating the workshops are also

directing The Center and implementing its advisory service.

Celia Houghton's association with the New World Foundation as well as with leaders in the open education movement in England, where she is from, was instrumental in getting the grant from the Foundation. The possibility of a consortium with M.A.P. at University of Bridgeport was explored, but the Foundation wanted the center to be independent from all university control.

The Center was established because those who participated in the summer workshops at the Convent expressed continual desires for workshops and support during the school year after going back into their classrooms. From 1970-1972, the Convent did sponsor an occasional workshop, but no funding was available from the Convent to support a full fledged teachers center.

The Center houses a resource library in the attic above a garage at the Convent, but much of The Center's resources are found in the informal classrooms operating at the school. Workshops are held in these classrooms. While teachers participate in the workshops, they also get a chance to get together informally and explore the materials in the classrooms.

The Greenwich, Connecticut School system has paid for several teachers to attend the summer workshops held at The Center during the past few years. It also grants

in-service credit to any teachers who participate in he Center's activities. For summer workshops, graduate credit has been available through Fairfield, University of Fairfield, Connecticut which has a Master's Degree Program in open education.

The Center publishes a quarterly bulletin called The Center which lists the workshops to be given as well as contains various articles about open education, both theoretical and practical. Ideas about activities which teachers can put into their classrooms are also included. In an attempt to maintain close contact with the desires of teachers, questionaires about programming are included with copies of The Center.

The Center has been instrumental in helping teachers trying to bring more informal methods into their classrooms in an area where school boards and administrators tend to be traditional. In Greenwich, it has been the teachers' responsiveness to this center's activities which has brought about quiet and limited support for the open classroom. The Center was badly needed as there is no other source to support informal education in the lower Connecticut and Westchester, New York area.

The Training Complex - Appalachian State University

The Teacher Training Complex at Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina was started in 1970 to provide more individualized instruction to the children in the nine communities surrounding the University. The Complex has programs in early childhood education, mental retardation, special education, career education, drop out prevention, elementary education and secondary education to serve professionals from the time they decide to enter the teaching profession until they leave it. It differs from most of the other teachers centers in being a program for teachers of children of all ages, not just young children.

The Complex is housed at the University, but much of the work of the Complex goes on within the public schools in the area. Members from schools in the nine counties in western North Carolina, the region surrounding the Complex, share in making decisions about the functioning of the Complex.

The Complex is financed jointly by a federal grant, State Education Department funds, foundation grants, the nine school districts in the region, the regional junior

colleges and by the University itself.[14]

The Director of the Complex works with five other professionals who work part time. Additional university staff members are serving as consultants from time to time.

From the reports issued by the Complex itself as well as from a monitoring visit paid by a project writer from the Office of Education,[15] the Complex seems to be a well-coordinated and field-oriented effort.

"Trainees--both pre-service and in-service--can receive a significant portion of their training in a setting similar to the one in which they are likely to work. They come in and learn by doing."[16]

The Complex which has a strong, community orientation, provides training for various people involved with children: aides, substitutes and day care personnel.

---

14. The proposal for 1973-1974 sought $150,000 from a federal grant, $13,706 from the University, $126,532 from state and local education departments, and $4,875 from a community college. "Proposal for Continued Funding of the Appalachian Training Complex-Appalachian State University-for Fiscal Year 1973-1974", Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina, budget section, unnumbered page
15. Mariya Futchs, "A Description of Appalachian State University Training Complex, Boone, North Carolina", Working Paper #4 Wisconsin Teacher Center Project-O.E.G. 0-71-1093(725), June, 1972.
16. "Proposal for Continued Funding of the Appalachian Training Complex", op. cit., p. 6.

The list of workshops scheduled by the Complex is very similar to those given at centers designed to spread open education techniques. This center has no such cause. Yet it is responsive to the needs of teachers in much the same way more informal centers are; the staff acts as an advisory team, workshops are given in arts and crafts and scrounge materials as well as in classroom management, informal meetings are held, and a materials resource center is available. The Complex doesn't use the words "informal" or "open" but the stated goal of the Complex is "to facilitate alternatives in the process of education."[17]

The Teacher Interactive Learning Center

The Teacher Interactive Learning Center, sponsored by the Hartford, Connecticut Public School System is an extensive program of in-service development. Begun in 1965, the purpose of the program is,

"To provide a vehicle which will make it possible for teachers to become self-directive by actively participating in the identification of their own needs and in the planning, organization, and conduct of programs for their own instructional improvement, to provide an interactive workshop where the dissemination of teacher-created instructional materials, successful methodologies and effective teaching techniques can be accomplished on a teacher-to-teacher, rather than on a supervisor to teacher basis."[18]

---

17. See Appendix C, No. 22.
18. "Teacher Interactive Learning Center Extract", op. cit., pp. 1-2.

The Hartford center is teacher guided and reflective of teacher priorities. The center will be evaluated with regard to how effective teachers feel the center has been in meeting their needs.

Included in the project proposal are plans for evaluation in order to assess changes in classroom climate, attitudinal changes, changes which occur in traditional vs. innovative classrooms, and value changes.

The center combines mini-courses, mini-workshops, exhibits, lectures, university courses, and model classrooms in order to offer a wide range of alternatives to teachers.[19]

The center is the main vehicle in in-service education in elementary education on the city; this is a position that few other centers hold. The city has a record of being committed to innovations in elementary education. In 1968, a program was started for kindergarten teachers and their aides to participate in three week training programs in Montessori techniques. Later, first, second and third grade teachers and their aides were included in such training. Eventually the Montessori training broadened to include techniques in informal methods from the British

---

19. "The Teacher Interactive Learning Center Extract", op. cit., pp. 1-8.

programs, especially in the area of open education, are not making full use of the resources at the center. More community involvement is mentioned as being needed. The list of the number of participants for each workshop is impressive as record keeping, but it shows many workshops could have been better attended.[21] The workshop titles for March, 1973 were not very enticing.

Nevertheless, the Interactive Learning Center is attracting teachers from beyond the greater Hartford area to its workshops and facilities. Students from M.A.P. in Bridgeport visit the center once a year. The center is also cooperating with more local colleges and universities in both graduate and undergraduate programs and is developing a program geared especially to the conditions and problems of urban education. The center's program is one in which teachers have input into the types of activities offered while having the full imprimature of the Board of Education.

With better coordination of in-service activities offered by alternative programs and greater effort to tailor programs to teachers' expressed desires, the center should be able to function more effectively in the future.

---

21. "A Progress Report and Summary of Activities, 10/72-2/73", Hartford, Conn.: Teacher Interactive Learning Center, pp. 2, 7-9.

infant school. The city has recognized the power of in-service training in effecting classroom changes as well as the need for teachers participating in such changes to have access to an on-going source of support and renewal.

In addition to the staff of the workshop working with teachers in their classrooms as an advisory, the center is open Saturday mornings and workshops are given Wednesday and Thursday afternoons each week. In March, 1973, workshops were held on the following topics:

"Go Fly a Kite, Musical A, B, C's, Helping Children Communicate; A Class Newspaper, Primary Science Learning Fun, The 16 M.M. Projector, The Tape Recorder, Cassette Recorder and Filmstrip Projector, The Overhead Opaque Projector and Language Master, How to Set Up a Media Learning Center in Your Classroom."[20]

The Center also offers Spanish language programs for parent volunteers, paraprofessionals, and teachers.

In the progress report of February, 1973, the accomplishments of the center are cited. There is a growing bank of teacher-made curriculum materials. The Spanish Language Program is well underway. Yet the center is not without its problems.

The bus strike prevented many teachers from getting to the center. The report says that existing in-service

---

20. Teacher Interactive Learning Center Newsletter, Vol. I, No. 5, March, 1973.

Notes on Additional Centers

The University of Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network

The Teacher Center Network affiliated with the University of Pittsburgh is an extensive in-service, pre-service, program implemented through teachers centers located in twelve elementary schools in the greater Pittsburgh area. The centers are clinical settings for educational training used by teachers, assistants, aides, counselors, and administrators. The affiliated schools are found in inner city and suburban communities and serve children with diverse cultural backgrounds.

The first centers were started in 1969 with funding provided jointly by the University and the school boards. In 1972-1973, the list of affiliated schools included ones in Pittsburgh proper, McKeesport, Allegheny, Williamsburg, Greenstone Oaks, and Greenburg Salem. The six public school districts contributed $465,000 in 1972-1973 which included funds for graduate intern stipends and joint salary support for 93 classrooms.

Services of the center complex during 1972-1973 reached 7,000 children, 671 education students, 250 teachers, and 500 visiting lay or professional people. Some of the graduate students were practicing teachers,

so the in-service component is larger than the figures suggest.[22]

The Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network has developed an extensive evaluation plan, a feature missing in most centers' activities. The Center Network is included as a profile because of this plan to determine the effectiveness of the Network.

The first step in the plan is to ask the various groups of people affected by the Network to define the goals of their participation. Goals for children, teachers, education students, university faculty, administrators, and the community at large need to be specified. The goals focus around 1) the learning process, 2) decision-making, 3) pre-service and in-service training, 4) a monitoring system to evaluate activities, and 5) the appropriate political action needed in order to achieve the goals of the Network. Few other centers mentioned the center as having political as well as educational responsibilities.

In the Pittsburgh evaluation format, concepts are formulated and standards articulated. Those facets of the program are delineated which should serve as evidence that the stated standards are being met. In addition, a comment

---

22. Information taken from the responses to the survey instrument.

is requested in order to identify any obstacle which prevents the standards from being reached.

An example of the way the evaluation methodology should work follows:

"Regarding children (the party affected)

A. design and implement environments which foster the development of individual characteristics.

1) Standard: The environment of the Teacher Center is marked by a pervasive effort and observable practices to identify and nurture the individuality of children.

2) Scale: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
no evidence extensive evidence

3) Comment: Identify the obstacles which should be dealt with in order to improve the conditions relative to this standard.

B. promote their participation in decision making processes which influence their educational experiences.

1) Standard: The development of educational experiences for children includes decision-making processes which involves them in roles on the basis of their awareness of the tasks and their skills as participants.

2) Scale: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
no evidence extensive evidence

3) Comment: Identify the most immediate obstacles which should be dealt with in order to improve conditions relative to this standard."[23]

---

23. Charles Gorman, Memorandum issued on March 9, 1973, University of Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network.

The total format is long and complicated. It was developed as of March 9, 1973 and issued as a memorandum to the Core and Clinical Faculty from Charles Gorman, the Director of the Program. The results of using this strategy are not available.

The complicated and tedious evaluation format is not characteristic of center functioning. Although Gorman lists teachers, the centers' administrative staffs, a community board, university faculty and education students as being involved in making the major decisions to determine center policy, it is hard to believe the group evolved such a plan, even though the plan would affect all of the parties.

This profile has been included to illustrate the fact that just because a program calls itself a "teacher center" or even a "teacher center network" doesn't mean that it is responsible to the needs of teachers. Each program needs to be carefully reviewed to determine who is actually making the decisions.

The design of teachers centers according to the guidelines for an effective change agent presented in this study have been actualized in many centers. The design holds the promise of a new era in in-service education. The responsibility in fulfilling that promise lies with those who are committed to the design to call attention

to ways in which the label has been used disregarding the basic premises of the design.

The Curriculum Workshop

The Curriculum Workshop at the Molly Stark School in Bennington, Vermont is another example of a teachers center which is closely connected with the elementary school in which it is located. The center was begun under the aegis of the Ford Foundation as a joint effort in curriculum development of several school systems in southwest Vermont, an orientation similar to the Dallas Teacher Renewal Center and the University of Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network. Since 1967, it has been receiving funds from the federal government under Title III, innovations in education. School systems in the area contribute about one-third of the funds necessary to operate the center.

The purpose of the workshop, in keeping with the guidelines on creativity as set forth under Title III, is to encourage teachers to engage in curriculum development, that is tailored to meet the specific needs of the children they teach.[24] In this intent, it is similar to

---

24. William W. Steel, "Title III Project Annual Report-1967-1968", Bennington, Vermont: Curriculum Workshop, Molly Stark School, July, 1968

most of the British teachers centers.

In addition to staff which works with individual teachers about their own concerns, a mainstay of the program is a well-equipped workshop where all kinds of learning materials are made. It is the contention of the staff of the workshop and the representatives of the school system who together act as a governing body that,

"1. People absorb and retain information and ideas better when all their faculties are involved-minds, emotions, bodies;
2. The younger the children are, the more they need to be involved with objects, and trying to get them to deal too early in abstracts is detrimental;
3. While all students benefit from the manipulative approach, for a good many it is the only approach to effective learning.
4. Pupils do better in school when they have the attitude that worthwhile activities go on and being involved in creating things helps to produce that attitude."[25]

While staff at the workshop hopes that research will be forthcoming to indicate the effectiveness of the center, an open invitation to interested educators and community members is issued with the following note,

"We don't issue this invitation (to come observe and participate) with the notion that our answers are best. But we are pleased with the way our children have responded to the program, and we believe children elsewhere would do the same."[26]

---

25. "I Hear and I Forget; I See and I Remember; I Do and I Understand", Bennington Vermont: Curriculum Workshop at the Molly Stark School, 1967, p. 1.
26. "Open Letter, Curriculum Workshop for Children, A Demonstration Center at the Molly Stark School, Bennington, Vermont", Bennington, Vermont: Curriculum Workshop, Molly Stark School, 1970.

The approach of the center is one of deep involvement without imposing the "right"answers. The workshop strives to put into practice the fundamental prerequisites of abstract thought- manipulation of concrete materials before formal, logical thought.

Westport, Connecticut

The Teacher Center in Westport, proposed by Assistant Superintendent Phillip Woodruff, will be funded solely through funds from the Westport Board of Education.

The building in which it will be housed is a site owned but no longer used by the federal government. The center is a project of the administration in conjunction with teachers. The head of the center will be salaried as a part of the administration but will serve as an independent agent linking the teachers with the board of education. This major impetus for this program is coming from the administration.

The Wednesday Program, Princeton,N.J.
The Four Day School Week, Unity, Me.

The Wednesday Program and the Unity, Maine Four Day School Week are both considered teacher center program by the Scholastic Teacher's Guide to Teacher Centers.[27] Both programs offer a limited physical facility, the workshop is the format for most programs,They state that teachers are

---

27. Howard, op. cit., pp. 10 and 18.

deeply involved in deciding which activities will be offered. What is distinctive about these programs is that all teachers must attend the sessions during which time the children in the district are sent home. The teachers are offered alternative courses and programs from which to choose.

Both programs recognize the need for in-service education and the strain that attending in-service programs after school place upon the staff. Many centers have said that it is desirable for teachers to be released from their classroom duties during the school day to attend center activities, but most feel that voluntary attendance of such programs is also important. While teachers are able to decide which activities will be scheduled and are able to choose among those given, the compulsory nature of the programs differentiates them from those of other centers.

The range in available topics make the reality - based sessions unusually attuned to teacher needs. The following topics are listed as being part of the Wednesday Program's calendar:

"Educational Research and Development", Wheel Throwing Pottery for Beginners", "Using Creative Materials in the Classroom #2", "Workshop for Parents of Children with Learning Difficulties", "Math Workshops", "Great Thinkers in the Field of Child Development", "Theater Games for the Classroom:, "Values and Teaching K-12", "Use of Hand Tools and Building Materials for the Classroom", "Cardboard Carpentry", "Technology for Children".[28]

---

28. Wednesday Calendar and Workshops, Vol. 6, Issue 1, Jan. 3, 1973, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Board of Education, 1973), pp. 1-6.

The Unity program includes drug education, training of parent volunteers, career education, math curriculum development coordination, and language arts curriculum development program.

Urban Resources

The Urban Resources Center in New York City enables the children and teachers in the New York Public School System to make better use of a variety of resources in and around New York City.

Funds from city taxes as well as school district funds are used to run the center. Foundation support has also been forthcoming.

The aim of the center is to search out the resources in lower Manhattan available to schools and to develop programs to utilize them. In addition to compiling a list of resources outside of the physical space of the center, there is available within the facilities an auditorium, two classrooms, display and exhibition space, and areas where workshops are held.

During 1972-1973, the center arranged for fifth grade classes to spend a full week working with center staff. While the programs varied from week to week, the sessions I attended stressed conservation and recycling.

The class spent a day touring a sewage processing plant and a sanitary land fill site on Staten Island. Students were asked to weigh the garbage and trash thrown

out in their households every day for the week. Averages of the families of children in the class were calculated and the children, with help, were able to find out how much trash and garbage their families discarded in a year.

Films were shown to the children on alternative methods of waste disposal. Costs for each method were calculated. Products of recycled glass were shown to the class. The children were asked to indicate the different ways a variety of materials could be recycled or reused; they classified the materials into organic and inorganic, burnable and not able to be burned, edible or inedible.

On the final day of the workshop, an expert in crafts displayed many items children could make from items usually thrown away. Then the children made some things to take home.

The program was extremely well organized; the children were very receptive. It is hoped that teachers will tell their colleagues about the way the program used community resources so that other teachers may make more use of resources within the community.

The Regional Encirhment Center

The Regional Enrichment Center in Kalamazoo, Michigan is the only center which listed as its goal the availability to teachers of resources too costly for an individual district to provide. Audi-visual equipment is borrowed; materials are made from a variety of materials;

teachers from the region attend workshops organized by the center.

Those teachers whose districts do not have membership status with the center may attend workshops but are charged an additional fee and are not given priority status for the workshops. In many cases, schools pay the workshop fees for their teachers.

Not specifically geared to open education, workshops are given which would appeal to all levels of teachers, administrators and parents. The workshop leaders are primarily area teachers and university professors. While most workshops are held at the center itself, some are held in local schools.

The center sponsors programs which are advocated by the administrations of the participating school district in addition to those which are considered valuable by the center staff. More research is needed to determine the extent of teacher participation in the decision-making processes of the center.

The Greater Boston Teacher Center

The Greater Boston Teacher Center was created in response to teachers who needed a year round support and educational system to follow the summer workshops they attended in open education.

While innovative programming has been occuring in both public and private schools in the greater Boston area,

it was workshops held as early as 1969 in the Shady Hill School and the Fayerweather Street School which created a nucleus of people interested in informal education who wanted to continue their own growth in this area.

Edward Yeomans, directer of the Greater Boston Teachers Center, has been responsible for helping to establish workshops across the country on informal methods. He has coordinated summer workshops sponsored by N.A.I.S. and also hosted a meeting of people involved in centers in November, 1973.

The center operates as a facilitator in getting people in touch with a variety of workshops in other centers as well as schools. In the quarterly bulletin entitled "Workshops for Teachers", workshops in the following locations were announced: New England Craftsmanship Center, Children's Museum, Shady Hill School, Concord Academy, Educational Development Center, the Children's Barn, Lawrence School, Central School, Store Front Learning Center, Parmeter School, The Teacher Center in Dorcester, the New England Aquarium, Workshop for Learning Things, Habitat School, Cambridge Friends School, Wheelock College Resource Center, the Museum of Science, Fayerweather Street School, and the Advisory for Open Education in Boston.[29]

---

29. Greater Boston Teacher Center, Workshops for Winter, Spring - 1972-1973", op. cit.

The center has been successful in arranging graduate credit for workshops by Lesley College, Simmons College, and Wheelock College. Students may pay university fees in addition to those charged for most workshops. In some cases, university staff supervises students who are taking center courses for college credit. This center is especially important to teachers in the large number of independent schools in the area who might otherwise not be able to take advantage of in-service activities or come into contact with their colleagues to share ideas and experiences.

The Center for Open Education

City College Advisory Service - Workshop Center for Open Education is quite different from most of the other centers affiliated with universities. It seeks to attract teachers off the street in addition to those involved in pre-service and graduate education programs at the college. Serving more than 2,600 people in the four months since the center was started, the center states that it wants to serve "the many school personnel and parents moving toward open education and to give help to those who want to begin."[30] The center thus draws people from college programs, people working with the advisory's program in the public schools and many more interested people.

The teacher center facility, now with expanded room for making materials and a curriculum library, is an

---

30. Questionaire response.

outgrowth of the advisory's Open Corridor Program. Lilian Weber has directed a group of teachers with experience in open education for the past several years who act as resource personnel or advisors to several schools in New York City.

The advisors try to meet teachers on their own terms and to move with them as far toward open education as they desire. The advisors emphasize using the large corridors to provide activities too space-consuming for the classroom. The interaction of several classes coming together for such activities is mutually beneficial.

Dr. Weber meets with her advisors on a regular basis to keep in touch with how the programs are progressing. It was only in 1972-1973 that the teacher center as a more extensive facility was established. The Open Corridor Program, the name of the advisory program in the schools, has been in existence several years and has been sponsoring intensive summer workshops.

Unlike other university affiliated centers, this center is funded totally through Title III funds (as of Spring, 1973). It may be that local sources of support may develop as time goes on.

Efforts to Coordinate the Teacher Center Movement on a National Scale

There have been several efforts to bring those people working in teachers centers together to exchange information and ideas. Some of these have been quite formal.

The first was a conference held at Syracuse University in April, 1972. This conference, reported in Syracuse University's School of Education bulletin Update[31] brought together people who were interested in centers in the U. S. and in foreign countries. Out of this conference is to come a study on U. S. teacher centers.[32]

Another effort was Scholastic Magazine's booklet entitled Scholastic Teacher's Guide to U.S. Teacher Centers.[33] In this guide is contained a brief description of centers located by the author, Clare Howard. While this guide does include programs which are outside the definition of teachers centers used in this study, it is a valuable resource in informing people of centers near them they might not have

---

31. "Teacher Centers: The State of the Art", Update, Syracuse University, School of Education, Spring, 1972.
32. Sam J. Yarger and Albert Leonard: A Descriptive and Analytic Study of the Teaching Center Movement in American Education. Sponsored by the National Teacher Corps and the Office of Career Education, U.S.O.E., Report said to be released in May, 1974.
33. Clare Howard, Scholastic Teacher's Guide to U.S. Teacher Centers, (New York City: Scholastic Magazines, Inc. 1972).

known about.

In December, 1972, the National Education Association published the N.E.A. Teacher Center Network, A Prospectus which called on centers throughout the U.S. to join together in a network in order to exchange information.[34] Notice of the document was found in N.E.A. newsletters and periodicals on the regional and national level. The proposal states that centers affiliate at different status levels according to whether they operate in districts where current union contracts are secured through N.E.A. efforts, whether the N.E.A. might be the bargaining agent at some time in the future, or whether the N.E.A. has no role, i.e. in centers associated with private schools, universities, community organizations museums, etc.

Since some of the largest and best organized centers are those started by teachers in private schools growing out of their experiences in open education workshops sponsored by the N.A.I.S., the N.E.A.'s proposal would be a divisive force rather than a uniting force among centers. Their plan would not give equal status or services to the three categories of affiliation. The use

---

34. Ole Sand, N.E.A. Teacher Center Network, A Prospectus, (Washington, D.C.; N.E.A., Dec., 1972).

of position to discriminate among groups has been consciously avoided by those in the center movement who see centers as a neutral meeting ground for all people in bettering the educational processes.

The Prospectus is concerned with the issue of who has the power in the centers. It defines teachers centers as organizations,

"operated by teachers--not merely for them. A distinctive feature of an N.E.A. Teacher Center will be the role of teachers in shaping the center's policies and programs through their professional organization. For years, teachers have participated only as school district employees in in-service programs planned by administrators filtering from the top down. Now teachers will reverse the funnel and plan their own programs in the N.E.A. Teacher Centers."[35]

The Prospectus lists services which would be available to full affiliates of the Network:

"a. developing a memorandum of agreement spelling out our mutual relationships,
b. assistance with contract negotiations with boards of education for establishing and financing the center,
c. help in developing the Teacher Center model,
d. continuing information about promising practices, resource personnel, instructional materials, and the like,
e. occasional practice improvement workshops for small groups of teachers from other geographic areas,
f. monitoring and evaluation,
g. endorsing and, after an appropriate time, certifying the Teacher Center."[36]

---

35. Sand, op. cit., p. 2.
36. Sand, op. cit., p. 7.

Those centers which do not meet the requirements for full affiliation would have less extended services.

Since the N.E.A. is a political as well as a professional organization, its aims are political. The Prospectus states that,

"The N.E.A. will encourage and promote Teacher Centers only in those locations where teachers have their working conditions defined in a collective bargaining agreement signed jointly by the local school board and the teachers' association. The rationale is: 1) If a Teacher Center is to do the job expected of it, teachers will be engaged in activities significantly different from those they now perform. They should have the right to participate in such activities without jeopardizing their security as school district employees; contracts will provide this security. 2) It is in the interest of the organized profession to encourage local associations to gain master agreements." 37

In spite of the problems inherent in giving centeres different ranks of affiliation and the problems relating to making union affiliation a condition of support, the N.E.A. is faced with still more difficulties in getting its coordinating effort moving forward.

The death of Ole Sand who headed the N.E.A. Committee on Teacher Centers in February, 1973 has slowed down efforts in forming a network. While the Prospectus states that the N.E.A. will select four centers with Option I status to serve as models for other centers, in May, 1973, the Committee had not yet assembled a list of

---

37. Ibid., p. 4.

existing centers.[38]

The entire N.E.A. effort may be making so little progress because many centers want to avoid bureaucratic red tape and organization by rank. The tone of the Prospectus does not reflect that of the majority of the Centers.

An Inspirational Effort

Madison Judson, an advocate of open education, became very interested in trying to establish a mechanism by which people working in centers throughout the U.S. could share their ideas and experiences. From July to November, 1971, he issued several working Papers in which he set forth his ideas.

Poetic, rather than practical, these papers deal with what Judson feels are the essential characteristics of good centers; informality, strong teacher participation, an advisory service, in-service or graduate credit for attending workshops at the centers, and educational management tools in team building and research.[39]

---

38. Ibid., p. 6. This was stated in a meeting with Dr. Robert Snyder, a committee member, in May, 1973.
39. The papers may be obtained by writing to Madison Judson, Churchill Road Elementary School, McLean, Virginia.

The papers cover the following topice:

"Suggestions and Notes to the Tasks, Interests and Goals of the Teacher Center (7/25/71)", "Aspects of Teacher Centering and the Helping Relationship in British Education (8/28/71)","Assisting the Development of Teacher Centers (8/14/71)", "Teacher Center Questions to be Answered (8/3/71)", "Reason for Teacher Centers (8/11/71)", "Teacher Center Elements (7/31/71)", and "Teacher Center--Development Ideas (7/31/71)".

As a poet, Judson has captured the essence of what teachers centers can mean; he has captured their flavor and mood. Whether or not his poetry can inspire those working in the centers enough to move them into a national network, remains unanswered. His poem, "Teacher Centers" begins as follows:

> Teacher centers are
> created,
> designed and
> operated
> to assist teachers in their
> continuing personal and
> professional development
> in,
> for and
> through
> the use of
> inservice teaching and
> inservice learning.[10]

---

10. Madison Judson, "Teacher Centers" in the Journal of Teacher Education, May, 1974.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

The purpose of this study, The U. S. Teacher Center Movement, has presented a methodology for surveying the establishment and operation of U. S. teachers centers. The study has been concerned with ten basic areas of center operation: goals and reasons for being established, time in operation, fiscal arrangements, staffing patterns, physical facilities, educational programs,communication of center activities, affiliation with other organizations, decision-making procedures and community involvement. Information has been presented in these categories about the centers as a group. Profiles of individual centers have been presented as an added dimension. The study has been concerned with those centers which have been referred to as teachers centers by at least one of several informed sources.

The study has presented a methodology used by a single individual to collect and analyze information about centers throughout the U. S. A questionaire was formulated, revised, and sent to all identified teachers centers. A follow up letter was sent to those centers which did not answer the questionaire the first time; an additional questionaire was enclosed. Forty-two centers out of fifty-nine (71% of all the identified centers) returned the questionaire.

The responses on the returned instruments were collated and tables were constructed to show trends evident in the data. The results of the questionaire were presented as Chapter III.

Materials printed by the centers, usually in mimeographed or photo offset form, were collected. The information they contained was sorted into those categories addressed by the questionaire. The materials also provided some of the information contained in the center profiles.

Fifteen centers were visited. Informal discussions were held with staff, as well as with teachers who were using or had used the centers. My participation in staff development activities for Head Start enabled me to understand how a program within the school system might or might not make use of the services a teachers center provides.

The study has isolated those aspects of educational change theory which give insight into those facets of tradition in-service programs which do not encourage long lasting and effective change and those aspects of teachers centers which do.

The study has been important because of the lack of research on teachers centers and the need to bring this type of in-service education to the attention of those involved in in-service programs in centers and in more traditional types of programs.

The study is important in that it looks at teachers centers as a form of in-service education which places the

responsibility for initiating, implementing, and evaluating the program with the teachers. The growth in teacher autonomy within the last decade has made this type of in-service training able to be effectively implemented.

Recommendations for Further Research

There is an overriding need for further research to determine the effectiveness, pervasiveness, and functioning of the teacher center movement in the United States. Very few studies of any sort have been conducted so far.

Attitudinal Studies

A variety of attitudinal studies need to be conducted to compare teachers' attitudes about traditional types of in-service programs with those offered by teachers centers. Principals might be surveyed to determine the differences they note in the attitudes of teachers who use teachers centers with those who do not. Studies are needed to compare graduate and undergraduate opinions about courses offered in the format of workshops as compared with non-workshop courses. Finally, research is needed to find out if attendance at workshops changes teachers' attitudes about how children learn and the most effective ways to help children in their learning.

Classroom Observations

Studies are needed in order to measure the effect of teachers centers on the classroom situations of teachers who use the centers. Observations are needed in order to detect changes in the environment both physical, emotional, and behavioral on the part of teachers and students. Are materials made in the centers actually used in the classroom? What affect does this have on children's learning?

Student Performance

While it would be difficult to find a direct relationship between student achievement and teacher participation in center activities because of the many variables involved, the purpose of the centers is to aid children's achievement in school. New measures of assessment need to be developed to rate students' behavior in areas now not commonly measured: productivity, use of time, independence, creativity, non-traditional skill development, self-concept, and the desire to learn. It is these areas that are most often the focus of center programs.

Paraprofessional Training

Centers are serving as the training grounds for all staff in the school. Centers are designing programs for parent volunteers, aides, and interns. Often this

auxiliary staff has little or no access to training. Studies are needed to determine to what extent centers are able to fulfill the need to integrate auxiliary staff into the school community. Are centers providing paraprofessional training not available through other educational institutions?

Teacher Competencies

As more states move toward competency-based teacher certification, skills rather than successfully completing a number of courses are becoming emphasized in teacher preparation courses. Center activities need to be investigated and compared with traditional courses as far as helping graduates and undergraduates gain and maintain desired competencies.

Educational Innovations

Many centers state that their goal is to help teachers implement curriculum changes within their classrooms. Studies are needed to find out if these teachers actually do make changes after participating in center activities. The kinds and extent of such changes need to be documented. Such studies might be most helpful if they focused on a single center and then looked at the classrooms of the teachers who used that center.

Teacher Personality and In-Service Education

Further research is needed to determine if teachers with certain personality characteristics and educational philosophy prefer one type of in-service education over another. Does voluntary attendance at center functions mean that those teachers who come share the same views about in-service education and classroom practices as each other and as the center staff? Do teachers who would be rated more "open" on the Barth Scale "Assumptions About Learning and Knowledge"[1] be more apt to use teachers centers?[2] Do teachers attitudes about open education change after they have participated in activities at centers which desire to spread informal education?

If one could identify those individuals most favorable to change, their cooperation could be sought when attempting to introduce change.[3] This might be important if schools could release only a limited number of people from the classroom responsibilities to attend teachers centers programs. People thus identified as favorable to change might be much more effective in introducing and sustaining change than those who were not.

---

1. Roland S. Barth, "Open Education - Assumptions About Learning and Knowledge", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1970.
2. Greene, John, Keilty, Joseph, and Sherran Rothman, "Assumptions About Learning and Knowledge, Instrument Validation", paper presented at A.E.R.A., Feb. 1973.
3. Jwaideb and Markus, op. cit., p. 31.

Studies on Individual Teachers Centers

In-depth studies, like the kind conducted on Appalachian State University Training Complex, are needed to assess if different types of centers function differently and have different effects. Studies are needed to document the daily functioning of individual centers.

Centers for Teachers of Older Children

Teachers of children of all ages need a place to go and people to serve as supports in their work. All teachers need to keep abreast of newly developed materials and would benefit from the opportunity to develop curriculum materials and resources for their classrooms. Studies are needed to determine the extent to which and the ways in which teachers of older children are using the centers. If centers can formulate programs which would serve all teachers, they might gain more financial security than if they serve only pre-school and elementary teachers.

Decision-Making Processes

In depth studies are needed to determine the extent and type of teacher involvement in the decision-making processes in the centers. A study which focused on these processes in a few selected centers which have been in existence for sometime and appear fiscally secure

might help newer, less well-established centers find ways which would help to ensure their continued existence. Centers which find ways of being responsive to teacher needs while being responsive to the needs of sources of financial support are likely to be more stable than those which can respond only to teacher needs.

Fiscal Stability

The most serious problem confronting the center movement is that of financial instability. Foundations and federal grants to centers as innovations in education will soon disappear. Teacher unions are not fighting for funds for teachers centers as they are for higher salaries, increased medical benefits, and other fringe benefits. School systems spend little money on in-service development and it is far cheaper to fund an instructor to give an eight session course than it is to pay for full time center staff and a physical facility.

A year has passed after the data from this study were collected. While new centers have been started, three centers are no longer in existence. Studies are used to determine how centers have achieved and can achieve financial security.

State as well as federal funding are possible sources of support worthy of study.

Surveys

Yearly studies are needed in order to keep abreast of developments and trends in the center movement. Studies could compare current data on the ten categories used in this study with past findings.

Future surveys might compare the number of people using teachers centers with that using other types of in-service programs and with the total teacher population in a city.

The field is open for study. Centers are presenting new and exciting opportunities for personal and professional growth.

"Teachers centers...
known likely,
shown likely,
to be effective
in improving
the
quality of life,
excellence of life,
breadth of life,
here and now and tomorrow for
all of the children of
all of the people."[4]

---

4. Judson, op. cit., p. 45.

Conclusion

Teachers centers are a growing alternative to traditional methods of in-service education. They are becoming part of existing educational institutions while not relinquishing their decision-making power to those same institutions.

While centers do not specify that they serve mainly teachers of elementary school children, a review of the activities and workshops scheduled reveal that this is most often the case.

Centers are found throughout the eastern, mid-western, and western United States, in large cities and small, but not too often in the south. This may be because those who compiled the lists of existing centers were not as familiar with those in the South.

Those people who are associated with centers and have used their services strongly support the work that they do. Teachers centers are a functioning model of alternative education; an alternative which is receiving more and more attention and which holds great promise for those teachers who choose to be responsible for continuing their own self-initiated, self-directed, self-implemented, and self-evaluated professional education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Finch, Arnold. Growth In-Service Educational Programs That Work. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1969.

Gross, Neal, Giacquinta, Joseph B., and Bernstein, Marilyn. Implementing Organizational Innovations. New York City: Basic Books, 1971.

Harris, Ben M. and Bessent, Wailand. In-Service Education: A Guide to Better Practice. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1969.

Havelock, Ronald and Havelock, Mary C. Training for Change Agents. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1973.

Jwaideb, Alice and Markus, Gerald W. Bringing About Change in Social Studies Education. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Educational Consortium, Inc., 1973.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York City: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Kozoll, Charles E. and Ulmer, Curtis, eds. In-Service Training: Philosophy, Processes, and Operational Techniques. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1972.

Maccoby, Eleanor and Zellner, Miriam. Experiments in Primary Education, Aspects of Project Follow-Through. New York City: Harcourt, Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1970.

March, James G., ed. Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965

Moffitt, John Clifton. In-Service Education for Teachers. New York City: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1969.

Rogers, Vincent R., ed. Teaching in the British Primary School. New York: MacMillan Co., Inc., 1970.

Rubin, Louis J., ed. Improving In-Service Education, Proposals and Procedures for Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Thornbury, Robert, ed. Teachers' Centres. New York City: Agathon Press, 1974.

Weber, Lilian. The English Infant School and Informal Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1971.

Articles

Bailey, Stephen. "Teachers' Centers: A British First," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 53, No. 3, Nov., 1971, pp. 146-9.

Branan, Karen, "Try A Teacher Center," Scholastic Magazine, Sept. 1972, pp. 16-20.

Collins, James S. "Teacher Centers: The State of the Art," Update, Syracuse University School of Education, Spring, 1972, pp. 1-2.

Eddy, Wesley P. "How Successful are the British Teachers' Centers?," Educational Leadership, March, 1974, pp. 509-511.

Edgar, Donald E. and Warren, Richard L. "Power and Autonomy in Teacher Socialization," Sociology of Education, Fall, 1969, pp. 386-399.

Goodlad, John I. "Staff Development and the League Model," Theory into Practice, Vol. XI, No. 4, Dec., 1972, pp. 207-214.

Green, John, Keilty, Joseph, and Rothman, Sherran, "The Barth Scale, Assumptions About Learning and Knowledge, Instrument Validation," paper presented at A.E.R.A., 1973.

Hapgood, Marilyn. "The Open Classroom -Protect It from Its Friends," National Elementary Principal, Vol. VII, No. 3, Nov., 1972.

Judson, Madison. "Teacher Centers," Journal of Teacher Education, May, 1974, pp. 44-46.

MacCarty, Donald. "Competency - Based Teacher Education," School Management and the Business of Education, Vol. 17, No. 8, October, 1973.

Miller, Thomas E. "School Co-ops and Shared Media Services," School Management and the Business of Education, Vol. 17, No. 8, Oct., 1973.

Pilcher, Paul S."Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" Phi Delta Kappan, Jan., 1973, pp. 340-343.

Silverman, Arlene. "A Santa's Workshop for Teachers," American Education, Dec., 1972

Waynant, Louise F. "Teachers' Strengths: Basis for Successful In-Service Experiences," Educational Leadership, April, 1971, pp. 701-713.

Reports, Research Notes, Papers, and Manuals

Brewster, Albert J. "Less School Better Learning: The Four Day School Week - Maine School District No. 3, Unity, Maine," Report to the General Subcommittee of Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, April 24, 1972.

Bush, Gloria S. "Learning Centers Project," Philadelphia School System Board of Education, Instructional Services Division, no date.

Curriculum Workshop, "I do and I Understand," Curriculum Workshop, Molly Stark School, Bennington, Vermont, 1972.

Day, David. "Informal Reports: Four Day School Week Project," District 3 Board of Education, Unity, Maine, 1971-1972.

DiCorleto, Helen, et. al. "A Progress Report and Summary of Activities: Teacher Interactive Learning Center, Hartford, Conn., October, 1972 - February, 1973," Teacher Interactive Learning Center, Hartford, Conn., March, 1973.

Appendix A

The Survey Instrument

DiCorleto, Helen, ed. "Teacher Interactive Learning Center - Extract," Hartford Public Schools, Hartford, Conn., 1972.

Futchs, Mariya. "A Description of Appalachian State University Teacher Training Complex, Boone, No. Carolina - Working Paper No. 4, Wisconsin Teacher Center Project," O.E.G. 0-71-1093(725), June, 1972.

Gorman, Charles. "Development of Clinical Settings for Teacher Training," University of Pittsburgh, April, 1970.

Gorman, Charles. "Evaluation of Teacher Centers," University of Pittsburgh Teacher Center Network, March, 1973.

Howard, Clare. "Scholastic Teacher's Guide to Teacher Centers," New York City: Scholastic Magazines, Inc., 1972.

Lord James of Rusholme. "Teacher Education and Training," Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1972.

Joyce, Bruce R. and Weil, Marshal. "Concepts of Teacher Centers," Washington, D.C.: E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, May, 1973.

Kreuter, Mortimer, et. al. "Bay Shore/S.U.N.Y. Teacher Center Project - A Position Statement, September, 1972 - January, 1973," Stony Brook, New York: S.U.N.Y., March 1, 1973.

Museums Collaborative, Inc., "Background Information and Current Program," New York City: Bureau of Parks and Recreation, Museums Collaborative, Inc., Spring, 1973.

Museums Collaborative, Inc. "Proposal for Development of a Modular Cultural Resource Center for New York City Public Schools," New York City: Museums Collaborative, Inc., Nov. 1, 1971.

"Open Letter, Curriculum Workshop for Children, A Demonstration Center at the Molly Stark School, Bennington, Vermont," Bennington, Vermont, Curriculum Workshop at the Molly Stark School, 1970.

Plowden, (A Report of the Center Advisory Council for Education, England.) Children and Their Primary Schools Vol. I and II. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

Rasmussen, Don. "The Philadelphia Teacher Center, A View from the Shop," paper presented at the Syracuse University Conference on teacher centers, April 7, 1972.

Rasmussen, Lore. "The Philadelphia Teacher Center, Its Evolution and Role in a Many Faceted Educational Partnership," paper presented at the Syracuse University conference on teacher centers, April 7, 1972.

Reynolds, John. "Proposal for Continuation of Funding of the Appalachian Training Complex - Appalachian State University, for Fiscal Year 1973-1974," Boone, North Carolina: Appalachian State University, 1973.

Sand, Ole. "N.E.A. Teacher Center Network, A Prospectus," Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., Dec., 1972.

Steel, William. "Title III Project Annual Report," Bennington, Vermont: Curriculum Workshop at the Molly Stark School, July, 1968.

Wiley, James W., "T.T.I. Design," New York City: The Teachers, Inc., 1973.

Woodruff, Phillip. "Final Report for Teacher Improvement Leadership Training Institute and U.S.O.E. Sponsored Conference of Teacher Leaders: Task Force '72 and the Classroom Teacher Looks at Educational Reform - Harpers Ferry, W. Va., March 31-April 2, 1972," Washington, D.C.: U.S.O.E., 1972.

Woodruff, Phillip and Konicek, Richard. "Preliminary Report - British Teacher Centers," Washington D.C.: U.S.O.E. Program Thrust '72, May, 1972.

Center Newsletters and Bulletins

Advisory and Learning Exchange. Newsletter. Washington, D.C., 1972-1974, published monthly.

The Center. The Center. Greenwich, Connecticut, Winter-Spring, 1972-1973.

Center for Open Education. Bulletin. Series of Winter Spring Workshops in Open Education. Storrs, Connecticut, 1972-1973.

Greater Boston Teachers Center. Workshops for Teachers, Fall, Winter, Spring, 1972-1973, published quarterly.

The Teacher Center. From the Teachers' Room. Dorcester, Massachusetts, Dec., 1972.

The Teacher Center. The Hickory Stick. New Haven, Conn., Sept., 1972-May, 1973, published monthly.

Teacher Interactive Learning Center. Newsletter. Hartford, Connecticut, 1972-1973.

Unpublished Materials

Barth, Roland. "Open Education - Assumptions About Learning and Knowledge." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University School of Education, 1970.

Judson, Madison. "Informal Papers", Reston, Virginia, August-October 1972.

Schumer, Ann Byrd. "An Educational Change Model: Pre-Service In-Service Continuum." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts School of Education, August, 1973.

Tilley, Herbert Thomas. "In-Service Teacher Education: A Tool for Change." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts School of Education, 1971.

Woodruff, Phillip. "British Teacher Centers and Their Implications for American Education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts School of Education, December, 1973.

APPENDICES

THE NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN
BRONX • NEW YORK 10458 212/933-9400

Appendix A

February 15, 1973

Dear

We are involved in a research project about U.S. teachers' centers and would like your cooperation in helping us collect information. We would appreciate your filling out the enclosed questionaire together with any literature about your center you think we would find useful.

We expect the project to be completed by Fall, 1973 and will include your name and the center's name when the results are published if you do return the questionaire.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and help.

Sincerely yours,

Sherran Rothman
Consultant for Open Education Program Development

SRS/pg

Research Survey: U.S. Teachers' Centers

Please answer ‹ questions to the best of your knowledge. If the answers given below are not appropriate for your situation, please make a note of this and respond on the back. Thank you.

Goals and Policy-Making

1. Why was your center started?

2. What is the stated goal of your center?

3. Who makes the major policy decisions which determine the activities of the center?

   School Board___ Funding Body___ Teachers___ Administrative Staff___

   Community Board___ Others(specify)___

Staffing Arrangements

1. What is the size of your staff?

   Fulltime:___administrative-professional ___clerical ___custodial

   Part-time:__administrative-professional ___clerical ___custodial

2. How are people from the community actively involved in the Center?

Environmental Layout

1. The approximate square footage of the Center is_____

2. Check which of the following facilities is available at the Center:

   social lounge___ kitchen___ administrative offices___

   space for making materials___ audio-visual equipment___ printing shop___

   scrounge materials___ display of commercial materials___ library___

   display of teacher-made materials___ large meeting room___

   other(please specify):

Fiscal Arrangements

1. How many years has your center been in operation? _____

2. What was your original source of funding?

   foundation___ government grant___ school board___ teacher supported___

3. What is your present source of funding?

   foundation___ government grant___ school board___ teacher supported___

4. Do workshop fees cover the cost of running a workshop? No___ Yes___

   If not, who pays for it?

5. Does your center have a general membership fee? No__ Yes___

   If so, how much is it? _____

6. Please check those services you offer without charge:

   workshops___ library___ in-school teacher training___ newsletters___

   advisory service___ informal meetings___ inspection of resource material___

   other (specify):

Programs and Services

1. Is the center affiliated with any school, school board, or university?

   No___ Yes___ Name:

2. Are teachers able to drop in? No___ Yes___

   Must they sign up for workshops beforehand? No___ Yes___

3. What hours is the center open? Monday_____

   Tuesday_____

   Wednesday_____

   Thursday_____

   Friday_____

   Saturday_____

   Sunday_____

4. Does your staff give workshops in schools? No___ Yes___

5. Does your staff offer an advisory service to individual teachers?

   No___ Yes___

6. Does the center give credit to teachers who take workshops or is credit available?

   in-service credit: No___ Yes___

   university credit? No___ Yes___

7. How do people find out about the activities of the center?

   mailing list___ newspaper ad___ radio or television___ word of mouth___

   flyers or posters___ other(please specify) _____

8. How many people used the center last year?

Additional comments:

Workshops

Please makes checks and/or additions to the workshop areas suggested below. If you would care to, attach a separate sheet which lists the workshops that you have offered.

Topic	Single Session	Multiple Sessions	Intensive Summer Workshop
General Workshops			
Aesthetics			
clay			
construction			
movement			
music			
painting			
photography			
printing			
scrounge-materials			
tri-wall			
weaving			
other (specify)			
Child development			
Classroom Management			
activity cards			
environmental design			
integration of subject areas			
record keeping & evaluation			
other (specify)			
Communication			
creative writing			
Haiku			
group dynamics			
puppetry			
Games			
Mathematics			
Science			

Appendix B

List of Centers Which Responded to the Questionaire

Advisory & Learning Exchange
Suite 506
2000 L Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20036 — Olive Covington

Advisory for Open Education
90 Sherman Street
Cambridge, Mass. 02140 — Allan Leitman, Judy Albaum

Appalachian Training Center Complex
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina — John S. Reynolds

The Basement Workshop
22 Catherine Street
New York, New York — R. Takashi Yanagida

The Center
Convent of the Sacred Heart
1177 King Street
Greenwich, Connecticut — Celia Houghton, Jenny Andreae

Center for Open Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268 — Vincent Rogers

The Children's Museum
Jamaicaway
Boston, Massachusetts — Becky Corwin

Community Resources Institute
Queens College
270 W. 96th Street
New York, New York 10025 — Ann Cook

Creative Environment Learning Center
1876 E. Firestone Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90001 — Mary London

Curriculum Workshop
Molly Stark School
Brattleboro, Vermont — William Steel

Dallas Educational Renewal Center
3120 Haskell Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204 — Ann Kieschnick

District Six Advisory Center
Morris and Coulter Streets
Philadelphia, Pa. 19144 — Marie Terulon

Durham Parent Teachers Center
Durham School
16th & Lombard Streets
Philadelphia, Pa. 19146 — Donald and Lore Rasmussen

Environmental Studies Project
P.O. Box 1559
Boulder, Colorado 80302 — Bob Samples and Gail Griffith
(no longer funded)

Fayerweather Street School
74R Fayerweather Street
Cambridge, Mass — Chris Stevenson

Follow Through Program
(Early Childhood Training Center)
Chauncey Harris School
315 Hudson Street
Hartford, Conn. 06106 — Mary Finn

Greater Boston Teachers Center
131 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, Mass. 02138 — Edward Yeomans

High Rock Nature Center
New York, New York — Eliot Wilensky

Learning Institute of North Carolina
1006 Lamond Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701 — Richard Ray

Maine School District #3
Four Day School Week Program
Unity, Maine — David Day

Mountain View Center for
Environmental Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302 — Tony Kallet

Multiple Alternatives Program
University of Bridgeport
Bridgeport, Conn. — Robert Kranyik, Joseph Keilty

New England Craftsmanship Center
P.O. Box 47
Watertown, Mass. 02172 — Thomas Waring, Lewis Wright

New England Resource Center
for Occupational Education
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Mass. 02160 — Richard Gustafson

Regional Enrichment Center
1819 E. Milham Avenue
Kalamazoo, Mich. 49003 — Warren Lawrence

Regional Teacher Center
for Northwest Ohio
University of Toledo
College of Education
Toledo, Ohio 43606 — George Dickson

Store Front Learning Center
90 West Brookline Street
Boston, Mass. 02118 — Eloise Barros

Studio Museum in Harlem
2033 5th Avenue
New York, New York 10035 — Edward M. Spriggs

The Teacher Center
425 College Street
New Haven, Conn. 06511 — Corinne Levin

The Teacher Center
470 Talbot Avenue
Dorcester, Mass. 02124 — (telephone disconnected, Center not able to be located.)

Teacher Interactive Learning Center
Chauncy Harris School
315 Hudson Street
Hartford, Conn. 06106 — Helen DiCorleto

Teacher Renewal Center
Boise Independent School District
1207 W. Fort Street
Boise, Idaho 83702 — Betty Jo Gormley

Teacher Training Program
S.U.N.U.
Stony Brook, L.I., N.Y. 11790 Lorraine Altman

Teachers' Active Learning Center
1265 Mission Street
San Francisco, Calif. 94103 Amity Buxton

The Teachers Inc.
2700 Broadway - Suite 6
New York, N.Y. 10025 James Wiley

Training Program for Teachers
in the Technologies
West Virginia University
Morgantown, W. Va. 26506 Paul DeVore

University of Pittsburgh
Teacher Center Network
Dept. of Elementary Education
Pittsburgh, Pa. Horton Southworth

Urban Resources Program
Federal Hall
26 Wall Street
New York, New York 10005 Jane Remer

Wave Hill Center for
Environmental Education
675 West 252 Street
Bronx, New York Bill Bet

Wednesday Program
P.O. Box 711
Princeton Regional Schools
Princeton, N.J. 08540 Kathleen de Ben

Wheelock College Resource Center
Wheelock College
Boston, Mass Neil Jorgensen

Workshop for Open Education
City College Advisory Service
Shepard 3
140th Street and Convent Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10003 Lilian Weber

Appendix C

Stated Goals of the Teachers Centers (Responses to Survey Question)

The stated goal of the center is

1. "(to bring about) a significant increase in the competencies of in-service and pre-service personnel." SUNY Bay Shore/Stony Brook Teachers Training Complex, Bay Shore, New York

2. "to provide a central agency to coordinate expensive school services for 57 local school districts in Southwest Michigan." Regional Enrichment Center, Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District, Kalamazoo, Michigan

3. "to give staff opportunities to play a responsible and creative role in the miniature society that is the school." The Wednesday Program, Princeton, New Jersey

4. "to provide opportunities to make materials, explore new curriculum ideas, discuss problems and successes with children and to rediscover what it is like to be a student." District 6 Advisory Service, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

5. "to improve the quality of educational personnel, to improve learning opportunities for youth, to strengthen the cooperative efforts of the university, public school and community personnel." Dallas Independent School District, Dallas, Texas

6. "to assist in the economic development of New England by providing services to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of vocational educational programs." New England Center for Occupational Education, Newton, Massachusetts.

7. "to develop multi-disciplinary materials for teachers of all grade levels." Environmental STudies Project, Boulder, Colorado

8. "to bring the messages of environmental education to as wide an audience as we can serve, so as to sustain and improve the quality of life both in the natural and man-made environment." Community Environment, Inc. New York City, New York

9. "to develop (a teacher's) your own potential and skills as well as to share experiences, skills and needs with others." Creative Environment Learning Center, Los Angeles, California

10. "to support the education of adults working with children." Workshop for Learning Things, Cambridge, Massachusetts

11. "to teach techniques of making useful and beautiful things of wood (and other materials to be added) and the techniques of design." New England Craftsmanship Center, Newton, Massachusetts.

12. "to assist teachers who want to bring about change in the direction of a richer use of all resources available for children--materials, the local and the more extended urban and rural environment, books, and other sources of information and people." Mountain View Teachers Center, Boulder,Colorado

13. "to develop educational programs, events and activities by and for students and teachers using resources and professionals in lower Manhattan." Urban Resources Program, New York City, New York

14. "exploration." Fayerweather Street School, Cambridge, Massachusetts

15. "to get children, teachers, and parents to work together in an open area classroom, to get some consensus of how people learn." Storefront Learning Center, Boston, Mass.

16. "to provide the technical and professional help that is necessary for change." Greater Boston Teacher Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts

17. "to help people regardless of their role or function to be comfortable with change, not to settle for panaceas and to offer a resource for searching out alternatives and solutions to problems." Advisory and Learning Exchange, Washington, D. C.

18. "to be a lending library, a workshop for making curriculum materials, a center for distributing scrounge materials to schools, and a place for ideas for classrooms." Wheelock College Resource Center, Boston, Massachusetts

19. "to serve as a central training site and center for display of resource materials." Early Childhood Training Center, Chauncey-Harris School, Hartford, Connecticut

20. "to provide instruction, resources, and coherency to our teacher education program." University of Toledo,Toledo, Ohio

21. "to provide self-improvement programs initiated by teachers in order to lessen the gap between educational innovation and teacher response." Boise Independent School District, Boise, Idaho

22. "to facilitate alternatives in the progress of education." Training Complex, Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina

23. "to engage in educational research and development to solve North Carolina's persistent educational problems." Learning Institute of North Carolina, Durham, North Carolina

24. "no stated goals. The unstated goals are to inspire teachers toward better meeting the students' needs and to provide assistance in this endeavor." Curriculum Workshop, Molly Stark School, Brattleboro, Vermont

25. "to offer opportunities for continuity of development services (at the workshop and through consultation) for beginners in open education and the dissemination of what has been learned. The overall objective is that the participant become an active learner himself and an active agent in his own growth." City College Advisory Service, New York City, New York

26. "to provide a vehicle which makes it possible for teachers to become self-directive by actively participating in the identification of their own needs and in the planning, organization and conduct of programs for their own instructional improvement." Teacher Inter-active Learning Center, Hartford, Conn.

27. "its primary purpose is to promote an understanding of man's environment through educational programs for the public and for the students and teachers of the New York City schools." Wavehill Center for Environmental Education, Bronx, New York

28. "A teacher center is a place to make things, to explore new curriculum ideas, and to discuss problems and successes with children. We believe that adults can create an exciting environment for children when they, too, are learning and exploring. A teacher center is not only for the professional teacher but is intended to serve everyone in the community who is concerned with learning. Those who are need to be involved with selections of materials and equipment and to have played, understood, and enjoyed them before they can share them with a child." Durham School Learning Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

29. "the improvement of in-service teacher education in the technologies." Training Program for Teachers in the Technologies, Morgantown, West Virgina

30. "to provide an on-going center for meetings and support through the use of the center." MAP Program, University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn.

31. "as a resource to express the cultural needs of the Black Community." Studio Museum in Harlem, New York City, New York

32. "to provide teachers, students, parents and other concerned citizens with the time, place and resources needed to bring about organized, responsible educational change." David Day, Maine School District, Unity,Maine

33. "to help teachers start open classrooms especially in Connecticut and New England." Center for Open Education, U. of Conn., Storrs, Conn.

34. "to help develop paraprofessionals, urban oriented, mature teachers who will teach for a long time and to develop curriculum materials." Community Resources, New York City, New York

35. "to help teachers who visit the museum (as well as others) widen their contact with and comfort with a variety of materials and experiences in learning." The Children's Museum, Boston, Massachusetts

36. "to be teacher training for urban children." The Teachers, Inc., New York City, New York

37. "in response to participants from summer workshops for continued support throughout the school year and to support teachers, administrators, and others interested in alternative styles of education...different styles of classroom practices." The Center, Greenwich, Connecticut

38. "to develop active learning at the teachers' level in order that they begin to develop active learning classrooms in the model of British primary schools, and to provide professional/personal support and facilitation of teachers' meeting their own needs within the framework of active learning, interdisciplinary curriculum, and content focus." Teachers' Active Learning Center, San Francisco, California

39. "The center was started to support teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents as a place where ideas could be exchanged, to provide resource materials, workshops, and a variety of educational experiences to facilitate professional and personal development. The center works to create effective change in the schools by looking at teaching and learning styles." The Teacher Center, New Haven, Connecticut

40. "to provide a research bank of historical and contemporary data vital for understanding the Asian experience in America." The Basement Workshop, New York City, New York

41. " 1. to develop environments which focus on the learning process as it pertains to all persons in the environment.
    2. to promote decision-making procedures which include participants from all groups affected by such decisions.
    3. to initiate appropriate political action for fulfilling the goals of the teacher center.
    4. to conduct activities designed to meet the needs of those who are engaged in both pre-service and in-service training.
    5. to establish evaluation systems to monitor all activities within the environment." Teacher Center Network, University of Pittsburgh, Pa.

42. "to bring the messages of environmental education to as wide an audience as we can serve so as to sustain and improve the quality of life both in the natural and man-made environment." High Rock Nature Center, New York City

Appendix D

Workshops Offered

Workshops Offered in Arts and Crafts

African Art
Afro-American Art
American Super 8 Revolution
Basketry
Batik
Box Sculpture
Birds, Batik and Cooking
Calligraphy
Celebrations, Plants, and Weaving
Clay
Collage
Color, Music and the Environment
Construction
Cooking
Creative Stitchery
Dance and Movement in the Open Classroom
Drama
Dry Mounting and Laminating Techniques
Exploring Different Materials
Fabric Design
Film Making
Games: A New Approach to Music
Guitar
Instructional Uses of Junk
Instrument Making
Jazz: An American Art Form
Kid's Pillows
Knitting
Macrame
Make Believe
Making Equipment from Wood
Making Musical Instruments
Media
Media in the Classroom
Mixed Craft
Music
Orff and the Inner City
Orff Instruments in the Open Classroom
Paper Activities
Paper Mache
Physical Education: A Humanistic Approach
Pin Hole Cameras
Photograph
Playground Construction
Printing

Rock Poetry
Saw Dust Creations
Sculpture
Setting Up and Using a Dark Room
Silk Screen
Simple Dolls for Classroom and Home
Simple Wooden Toys
Soft Toy Workshop
Sound and Environmental Music
String and Rope
Visual Media
What to do with a piece of paper
Whistles and Strings
Woodworking
Woodworking and Plexiglass

Workshops in Classroom Management and Design

Activity Cards
Alternative Model Schools
Answering Parents Questions About Open Education
Child Development
Children's Thinking
Children's Work
Coping in the Classroom: A Psychiatrist Talks with Teachers
Creating an Inflatable Environment
Cultivating Sensitivity in the Classroom
Developing Learning Centers
Discipline and Parents
Does the Space You Teach in Make Learning Harder?
Explorint and Criticizing the Space you Teach in
Free Schools--Starting One
Group Dynamics
How to Conduct a Meeting
Introduction to Piaget
Let's Build a Place for Learning
Making Family Grouping Work
Making Something for Your Room
The Management of Change
Management Training
The Middle School
The Montessori Method
The Open Classroom and the First Year Teacher
Open Scheduling
Opening Up Children
Parent Involvement
Principals' Awareness Workshop
The Process of Individualization
Production Thinking Workshop
Record Keeping and Evaluation
Repairing Classroom Equipment
Research on Open Education
The Role of the Social Worker in the School
Student/Faculty Communication
Taxes, Taxes: Can I Deduct?
Teacher Idea Exchange
Teacher Share-In
Using Color and Texture Effectively in Your Classroom
Using Parent and Community Resources
Volunteer Training

Workshops in Communication Skills

African Story Telling and Games
Book Binding
The Break Through Program
Break Through to Literacy: British Reading Scheme
Building Curriculum Around Sports
Calligraphy
Children's Writing
Communicating Through Your Senses
Creative Writing
Drama
Expanding and Extending the Abilities of the Accomplished Reader
Film Making
Group Dynamics
How to Conduct a Meeting
Language and Its Crafts: Paper-Making, Graphics, Printing and Printing Processes, Photographic Techniques, Book-Making, Story Telling and Reading Aloud
Language Arts
Make Believe
Make It Take It Reading
Making Reading Materials
Media in the Classroom
New Audio-Visual Equipment
The Novel and Adolescence
Oral History and Story Telling
Pantamine
The Picture File
Producing a School Newspaper
Prose, Poetry, and Children's Writing in the Open Classroom
Psychodrama Presentation
Puppetry
Reading
Sex Roles in Children's Literature
Spelling by Contract
The Tape Recorder
The Teacher as a Group Leader
The Teacher as a Person
Tips for Reading Tutors
TV Workshop - Educational Uses
Video Tape
Words in Color
Young Children and Non-Verbal Communication

Workshops in Science and Mathematics

All About a Rabbit Corner
Animals in the Classroom
Animal Cages and Insect Homes
Aquatic Animals and Their Environment
Attribute Games and Problems
Batteries and Bulbs
Behavior of Mealworms
Birds, How to Use Birds in Your Classroom
Blocks for Children 3-8
Bones
Butterflies and Crayfish
Cards and Crading
Cocking
Cuisinaire Rods
Discover Your Environment
Drug Education
Environmental Math
Environmental Studies
ESS Workshop
First Aid
Geoboards
Health
Individualizing Science and Math
The Inquiry Method
Make-It Take-It Math
Making a Terrarium
Making Bottle Gardens
Making Learning Packages
Making Math Manipulative Materials
Math Tricks
Measurement of Area and Volume
Measuring Time by Making Clocks
Nature and The Arts
No-Cook Recipes
Nutrition
Personal Measurement
Plants and Animals
Probability
Properties of Light
Reptiles as Classroom Pets
Super Market Math
Teaching Math With Fingers
Trips Using the Neighborhood Environment

Workshops on Social Studies

Africa: Myths and Reality
Africa: Where to Begin
African Art
African Rhythms
African Story Telling and Games
Afro-American Art
Bi-Lingual Early Childhood Education
Bolivia
Career Education
Censorship
The City
Chile
Classroom Censorship
Design a Game-Play A Game
Drug Education
Environmental Studies
Great Decisions: 1973
How to Conduct a Meeting
How to Get Your Students into the Community
Integrated Studies in the Open Classroom
Man, A Course of Study
Map Skills
The Museum: A Classroom Resource
Museum of African Art
Oral History and Story Telling
People and Technology
Producing a School Newspaper
Sexism and Education
Simulation Games for Contemporary Social Science Programs
Social Studies in the Open Classroom
Teachers, Children, and the Museum of Science
The Vocational Curriculum
What's Happening in Social Studies
Work Jobs

ADDENDUM

Two works have been released too late to be included in this study. See them for further information about the U. S. teacher center movement.

Yarger, Sam. J. and Leonard, Albert. "A Descriptive and Analytic Study of the Teaching Center Movement in American Education." School of Education,Syracuse University. Sponsored by the National Teacher Corps and the Office of Career Education, O.S.O.E. Final report due to be released May, 1974.

Journal of Teacher Education, May, 1974 issue.

Both items testify to the need of further research concerning teachers centers and the increasing attention being given to this form of in-service education.